





*F. W. Bradley Esq*

# THE GOVERNING RACE:

*1848*

*(6)*

A BOOK

*On perfect*

FOR

*3 Leases terms out  
at the end*



*See another one*

THE TIME, AND FOR ALL TIMES.

*in Battlett No 1906*

BY H. O. R.

~~~~~  
"God shall enlarge Japheth, and he shall dwell in the tents of Shem; and Canaan  
shall be his servant."—*Genesis, 9: 27.*  
~~~~~

WASHINGTON:

THOMAS MCGILL, PRINTER.

1860.

*W. H. H. H.*



# THE GOVERNING RACE:

## A BOOK

FOR

THE TIME, AND FOR ALL TIMES.

By H. O. R.

---

"God shall enlarge Japheth, and he shall dwell in the tents of Shem; and Canaan shall be his servant."—*Genesis*, 9: 27.

---

WASHINGTON:  
THOMAS MCGILL, PRINTER.  
1860.

CASE

F 44/9

R 2

1860

---

Entered according to act of Congress, in the year 1860, by

T H O M A S M c G I L L ,

In the Clerk's office of the District Court of the United States for the District of  
Columbia.

---

10. 10. 1/2 3 / 13.

# THE GOVERNING RACE.

---

## PART I.

### IS SLAVERY SANCTIONED BY THE OLD TESTAMENT ?

The furious controversy concerning Negro Slavery, now raging throughout our land, is no longer a mere political question. Both parties have appealed to the BIBLE.

Those who sustain or vindicate the slavery of the negro race in the United States justify themselves by asserting that "this institution is just, wise, and beneficent;" that "it is ordained by Nature, and is a necessity of both races."—*Speech of Mr. O'Connor.*

They also declare that "this social institution (slavery) is founded entirely on the revealed laws of God; the Bible is the source of all our laws as well social as civil, and hence reverence and worship of its Divine Author are more general among southern slaveholders than almost any other people."—*De Bow's Review, Vol. 3, No. 1, January, 1860, p. 12.*

Furthermore: "That slavery is a great moral, social, and political blessing—a blessing to the master, and a blessing to the slave."—*Speech of Senator Brown, of Mississippi.*

The abolitionists, on the other hand, assert (of slavery) that "God has forbidden it."—*Dr. Cheever's Speech, at the Cooper Institute.*

"Slavery is founded on principles of injustice, extortion and oppression, manslaughter and robbery; slavery is the foster-parent of inhumanity and murder."—*Sermon by Rev. Dr. Matison.*

"American slavery is the sum of all villanies, and a combination of all cruelties, crimes, and robberies, of murder, piracy, and adultery, and whatever else is impure, unholy, and accursed."—*Resolution of the Anti-Slavery Convention, Buffalo, January 10, 1860.*

From the above expressions of the anti-slavery party—and volumes might be filled with the like bitter invectives against the system—it must be plain to every reflecting mind that this fierce and agitating controversy cannot be settled by compromises. It is a question between right and wrong, morally, not politically considered; it is, therefore, taken out of the reach of expediency altogether.

Even the most upright and patriotic statesmen, were they wise and self-sacrificing as those who won our independence and framed the Constitution, could not settle this now vexed question. Those who deny the right of man to hold another man in the bondage of slavery spurn the authority of the Constitution and the laws of Congress; they appeal to a “higher law.”

There must, then, be found somewhere moral power to compel obedience to the Constitution of the United States, or the Union will be dissolved, or resort had to physical force.

The law of God is the rule directing and compelling a rational creature in moral and religious actions. There is no moral law-giver save the Lord God. There is no code of His divine law save that contained in the BIBLE.

Let us, then, people of the United States, take up this momentous question in the true spirit of Christian obedience to God’s law; seeking, reverently, to understand what is set forth in the Old and New Testaments concerning slavery, and submitting ourselves to the authority of the Bible as the only unerring standard of truth and righteousness.

The Bible gives us three notable instances of laws in which our Creator imposed certain specified penalties for sin on certain classes of the human race.

The first was God’s sentence on Adam for eating the forbidden fruit. “In the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread.” The ground was cursed for his sake, (or sin,) and all his sons, to the end of time, were subjected to the same hard necessity of labor.

Will any Christian say that this sentence of God was unjust? Will any man of right reason contend that this judgment ever has been set aside without worse evils to the human race than hard labor being the result?

When the penalty for disobedience—death—was for a time remitted to fallen man, was not hard labor the best condition in which he could be placed for his repentance and reformation? If Adam and all his descendants had submitted to the punishment, and had “done well” their work, would they not have been accepted of the Lord? Have not the most dreadful crimes against God and man resulted from the selfish attempts made, by individuals and classes of men, to escape this universal doom



of labor, and to impose their own tasks on others, while those selfish rulers of the people live on the bread earned by the sweat and blood of the laboring classes?

Do we not feel that God's law, in this penalty of hard labor, is founded in mercy as well as righteousness, and that its failure to reclaim man arises from his own sins against this righteous ordinance?

So, too, of the second penalty: God's sentence on Eve. She was subjected to increased sorrows in maternity, and to that dependence on her husband which placed her under his personal control; and this doom for her transgression was to be and is imposed on all her daughters, and will be on them to the end of time.

Will any Christian say that the sentence was unjust? Will any man assert that this law should be abrogated, and the wife cease to "reverence her husband" as "the saviour of the body?" Would it be well for humanity to have this penalty set aside, and the wife, spurning dependence upon her husband, and leaving the duties of home and the care of their little children, push forward in the conflicts of public life, and engage in the hard labor that wins bread?

The third instance of these special judgments for particular sins was that given against the posterity of Ham. The earth was recovering from the curse of the flood, which the "corruption of all flesh" had rendered inevitable. Noah and his three sons, and the children born to them after the flood, were beginning to enjoy the fruits of their labor when the awful scene occurred.

A class of persons, descendants of Canaan, the son of Ham, was doomed to a state of servitude, of menial labor and dependence for their improvement on their brethren, the descendants of Shem and Japheth.

We will give the text, because it is not always convenient for the reader to seek out references, and this text is very important:

"And Noah began to be an husbandman, and he planted a vineyard.

"And he drank of the wine, and was drunken; and he was uncovered within his tent.

"And Ham, the father of Canaan, saw the nakedness of his father, and told his two brethren without.

"And Shem and Japheth took a garment, and laid it upon both their shoulders, and went backward, and covered the nakedness of their father: and their faces were backward, and they saw not their father's nakedness.

"And Noah awoke from his wine, and knew what his younger son had done unto him.

"And he said, Cursed be Canaan; a servant of servants shall he be unto his brethren.

“And he said, Blessed be the LORD God of Shem; and Canaan shall be his servant.

God shall enlarge Japheth, and he shall dwell in the tents of Shem; and Canaan shall be his servant.

(See Genesis, 9th chapter, verses 20 to 28, inclusive.

Such is the brief record of holy writ. The import cannot be mistaken, nor the penalty of the transgressor misunderstood. A class of persons, descendants of Canaan, the son of Ham, were sentenced to perpetual servitude or inferiority, and the descendants of Shem and Japheth—the latter more especially designated as superior—should be masters.

Let us pause here and examine the nature of the sin which could justify Noah in passing such a sentence of degradation on his “younger son.”

Obedience to the law of God is the first duty of man. This divine law settles the destiny of the human race.

It was this law which governed Adam in Eden, and “disobedience” was the sin that “brought death into the world, and all our woe.” Next to obedience of man to God, our heavenly Father, comes the duty of obedience of children to their human parents.

This is proven, because such obedience is made the first commandment of the second table, thus showing it to be the root and foundation of moral requirements in the laws that govern society. Obedience to parents establishes in their children the habit of obedience to law, and also sanctifies the religious principle in human nature, by giving honor to that condition of life which represents the relation of man to his God.

So important for human improvement is this obedience of children to their parents, that the merciful God, condescending to the weakness of our fallen nature, offered a *reward*, the promise of *long life*, to those who honored their parents. No other commandment in the decalogue has a promise annexed.

But were the laws of the decalogue in force when Ham sinned?

Assuredly; because these moral laws are righteous, and righteousness is eternal.

Disobedience to parents was not and is not sin because forbidden in the fifth commandment, but because it was and is a sin of itself; therefore it was and is forbidden.

Noah, the “the preacher of righteousness,” understood the requirements of God’s moral law. He knew, as well as we do, that murder was sin. Had not Cain been condemned by this law?

He knew that adultery was sin; and all the myriad corruptions that flow from disobedience to the moral law. Had not those sins been punished by the awful judgment of the FLOOD?

Sin is, in its own nature, a disturber and disorganizer. It debases before it destroys. It is disobedience to God, and adherence to the devil:—as manifested by our first parents.

The sin of Ham, that of dishonoring his father, was aggravated in the highest degree by the relation which Noah held to the future of our fallen race. He was the head of humanity on earth. He was prophet, priest, and king. He represented the judgment and the mercy of God and man. He embodied, in his experience and wisdom, the laws, precepts, and knowledge which were to guide his posterity in the better way.

It is no excuse for Ham to say that his father had done wrong ; that he had debased himself by drunkenness.

We do not seek to palliate the transgression of Noah. In yielding the reins to appetite, and thus dethroning reason, he had committed a grievous sin against the natural laws of God. Was he not most grievously punished for his fault when “he awoke from his wine, and knew what his younger son had done unto him ?”

Think of the old man, the loving father, who had seen the world of transgressors swept from off the earth because of their wicked lusts and corrupt imaginations : and then to find the poison of the same polluting depravity in his own family—the little group spared from the general destruction.

What was the anguish of the Roman Brutus, passing sentence of death on his own sons for treason against the State, compared with the sorrow of Noah, dooming his “younger son,” for treason against nature and rebellion against God, to that condition of perpetual inferiority which, like a brand of shame, would mark a portion of his (Noah’s) descendants forever !

As in the case of Adam and Eve, it was *sin* that brought the curse and the punishment. The sentence is proof of the guilt of the sinner. The doom was not from Noah, but from the justice of a righteous God.

Ham had shown, by his conduct, that he loved iniquity. His sin was more wicked in its inception, more polluting in its nature than the fratricide of Cain. The brother struck at the natural life of his brother ; the son claimed to overthrow and destroy the moral life of mankind by the dishonor of his father. Had Ham’s sin gone unpunished, all fear and love of God, all reverence and obedience for His laws, must have perished, because only through and by the parental relation was religious duty then taught and exemplified.

He who commits sin is the servant of sin. Ham had, by his own wicked carnality, sold himself to the power of evil ; he was in the bonds of corruption. The penalty of his awful crime was

death! There was only misery and destruction before him and his till the sentence was pronounced.

Then we see how mercy preponderated. Ham was reprieved from direct personal punishment, and only *one* of his four sons was subjected to the penalty of servitude. Even to Canaan there was mercy shown. He was to live and not die. His brethren were his keepers, his task-masters, and in the special promises made them and their posterity he and his were included.

Why was Canaan, the youngest son of Ham, singled out for this doom of servitude? Commentators and expounders of scripture have conjectured that this son was with his father and joined him in mocking Noah. But what God has not revealed concerning this transaction, human reason can never discover.

We know, however, if we believe the Bible to be divine revelation, that "the judgments of the Lord are true and righteous altogether. (*Ps.*, 10: 9.) We *know* that "the curse causeless shall not come." (*Prov.*, 26: 2.)

There is no recognition of any original inequality between the three brothers, causing the differences in their destinies. It was the natural propensities, exhibited in this transaction, which decided their condition.

Had the brothers of Ham listened greedily when he "mocked at his father," had they yielded to his wicked temptation of dishonoring him by indulging in pithy imaginations concerning their father, they, too, would have been accursed. Their chaste reverence and filial obedience were accepted and rewarded, and thus the good gained its first great triumph over the evil in our fallen world.

"Cursed be Canaan; a servant of servants shall he be unto his brethren.

"Blessed be the Lord God of Shem; and Canaan shall be his servant.

"God shall enlarge Japheth, and he shall dwell in the tents of Shem; and Canaan shall be his servant."—*Genesis*, chap. 9, verses 25-6-7.

Has not this announcement of the destiny of the three tribes or races of men, descended from Noah, come true, according to the WORD?

Does not history, secular as well as sacred, confirm the truth of this prophecy in the past?

Is it not true at this moment that the posterity of Japheth dwell in the tents of Shem, and that the posterity of Canaan are in servitude to the posterity of Japheth?

We have not time now to spare to go into details here, or to quote authorities; but no person acquainted with ancient annals can deny that one race, the black, a branch of the Hametic stock,

has, so far as is known, always been in a state of servitude, either to tyrants of their own color, or to masters of the other two races.

The hieroglyphical records of the oldest monuments of old Egypt show the black man then a slave. Nearly the whole continent of Africa is now a place of black slaves. If some few of these men, as rulers, have liberty to destroy or sell others of their own race, the women, one-half the population, are without exception slaves to the physical force and brutal lusts of the male descendants of Ham. From the ferocious king of the Ashantees, whose ornaments and monuments are the skulls and bones of his slave victims; to the Yorubas of Central Africa, whose government is a "perfect despotism," and on to the Makololos of the South, described by Rev. Dr. Livingstone, where the negro man is supported by the labor of his slave wives, we find two conditions of life, *polygamy* and *slavery*, everywhere. Till the first is overcome it is in vain to talk of freedom or improvement for the black race.

The whole negro population of Africa, some eighty or a hundred millions, with the exception of those belonging to Liberia, and, perhaps, some few tribes improved a little under British rule at Sierra Leone, now manifest in their low animal propensities, the same utter lack of reverence for duty, the disregard of decency, and the insensibility to shame, which characterized the conduct of Ham towards his father Noah, more than four thousand years ago.

These sensual propensities, when predominating, mark the lowest type of human beings, whatever may be the color, or in whatever caste, country, or condition they may be found.

We know that such people never improve when living together, without care or coercion, or both, from persons of better developments. We can understand that such a race must be degraded, would degrade themselves, and that only by divine miracle, or by the natural means of subjection to, and training by, a higher class of minds, a better organized race, could the lower type be influenced, instructed, and finally improved.

Was it not merciful, as well as righteous, for the wise and good God to place such a race under tutelage or subjection, that they might be saved from themselves?

*"A servant of servants shall he be unto his brethren."*

Was God's sentence on Canaan, by the mouth of Noah, an unjust judgment? It was the punishment of a great sin, not the arbitrary decree of an offended father; it was from the Lord.

*A state of human servitude or slavery is then compatible with*

*divine justice, with the perfect righteousness of God's laws, as surely as the necessity of hard labor in order to gain bread is for man, or the sufferings of women in childbirth and the subjection of the wife to her husband are compatible with His righteousness.*

The aim of just punishment is to make those that suffer it better, and not worse. When it has the latter effect, it is through the perversion of the law by the criminal himself, or through the sins of other criminals; not by the penalty he suffers.

Now, let us see what were the regulations given in the Bible concerning slavery; let us see if these are not framed so as to make the servitude of the condemned race a blessing, and not a curse.

Abraham\* is the first slaveholder on record; yet from the tenor of the divine history there can be no doubt of the prevalence of slavery among all nations before that era. When the covenant of God was established with the patriarch, all his servants were admitted to the rite of circumcision, all were made members of the church, and thus given the opportunity of knowing and serving the true God.

Was not this a blessed privilege to those born idolators? Was it not better to be a servant or slave of Abraham than a free citizen of Sodom?

From the time of this patriarch till the giving of the law on Mount Sinai, there are few direct allusions to slaves or bond servants among the chosen people.

But let us dwell a moment on the memorable narrative of Joseph's enslavement. His brethren "hated him," seized him by violence, "sold him to the Egyptians." Were they as wicked as murderers? They committed a heinous crime; but was it as "accursed" as the sin they had proposed, when they said:

\*It has been urged by those who denounce slavery as sin, that Abraham was drawn into polygamy by having bond women in his household, and that the two institutions are, therefore, coincident and equally iniquitous. No conclusion could be more erroneous. The connection between Abraham and Hagar was not marriage. He never considered the bond woman as his wife, never defended her conduct, never protected her from the anger of her mistress and his wife, Sarah. Hagar was the slave always, and her son was not the true heir, as St. Paul bears witness. The whole history of that miserable attempt to bring about the purposes of divine wisdom by human devices, wicked in their inception, because contrary to God's holy law of marriage—one man with one woman, the twain made one—as established at the creation, shows the folly as well as sinfulness into which those persons who are really seeking to do good will fall, if they set aside the laws of God, or interpret His statutes to suit their own selfish purposes.

"Come, let us slay him?" (*Gen., chap. 37, verse 20.*) Were they punished as God punished Cain?—as he punished Ham? Let these questions be well considered before we brand *slavery* as "*the sum of all villanies.*"

Joseph was sold a slave in Egypt, and his example is a model for all in his condition. He feared God and kept his commandments, and was faithful in all his duties to those whom he served. God blessed Joseph in his bondage; and so will He bless goodness in every condition of life. Did the servile condition of Joseph disgrace him, or prevent his final exaltation? Nay, more: was it not the direct means to his promotion in honor and usefulness? Could a sinful condition have done this?

Did either of his masters suffer because of buying and holding him in slavery? Did not each party, master and servant, gain good by the connection? Could this result have been reached if *slavery is sin, like disobedience to parents, murder, adultery, theft, false witness, covetousness?*

The seed of Jacob were destined to become slaves in Egypt. The manner by which they were reduced to servitude was unjust and wicked; their taskmasters were cruel. For this cruelty and injustice the Egyptians were punished.

If *slavery is sin*, would it not have been rebuked in this instance, because here was a flagrant breach of the law of *servitude for sin*, as established in the case of Canaan? The Hebrews were of the race of Shem, consequently were not subjected by that law to the inferior race of Ham. Yet not a word of condemnation against *slavery itself* is to be found in the Mosaic history; all the denunciations are against its abuses.

Nor were the Hebrews encouraged to seek their own liberation, or permitted to avenge their own wrongs. Even Moses, when he killed the cruel Egyptian tormenter, was severely punished by the ingratitude of those he sought to aid, and by his own self-banishment for forty years; and his crime brought additional severity of bondage on his brethren in Egypt. God did not instruct His people to "*take their liberty at all hazards.*"

When Moses was sent to free the Hebrews they were not incited to any act of violence, any deed of sin. They were to obey all the laws of God, and through His providence look for deliverance. (*Exodus, chapters 3d, 4th, 5th, 7th to 15th.*)

Will American abolitionism take this Bible pattern of emancipation for its rule? Will it keep God's laws?

At length Israel was emancipated and brought out from Egypt, not as independent individuals, who had, each one, the "*inalienable right to personal liberty,*" but as *servants of Jehovah*, the only living and true God; a condition that every son and daugh-

ter of Adam inherits: all are equal here—all are bound to obey the laws of God.

Did the laws of God establish slavery in the Hebrew nation? Did the decalogue sanction slavery by its injunctions?

Let us carefully examine these questions.

When the Hebrews stood before Mount Sinai they were just freed from Egyptian bondage. Probably there was not a slave in the congregation. What an opportunity was here to impress on this chosen people of God the sinfulness of slavery—if it had been sin.

If slavery—the property of man in man—had been the “sum of all villanies,” “the mother of all crimes,” would not God, by the Son He gave, have prohibited it as strictly, at least, as He prohibited murder, adultery, theft?

Yet we find that the Lord God in *two* of the *ten commandments*, which were to be the standard of all morality in the civil as well as religious codes of mankind, did provide for the condition of personal servitude.

The fourth commandment provides that the blessing of the Sabbath shall be on the servant or bondman, as well as on the master. Rest from labor one-seventh portion of time is the privilege of the slave; thus showing that God cares for all men equally, and has so framed His statutes that all may serve Him acceptably, in whatever condition of life He has placed them.

Thus we see that the law of the first table secures the right of the slave to worship God. The law of the second table secures as surely the right of the master to hold his servant.

In the tenth commandment “Thou shalt not covet thy neighbor’s man servant, nor his maid servant,” is as peremptory a prohibition as that which forbids theft. The desire, even, to take away the servant from his master is sin.

That the condition thus recognized and regulated by the laws of the Almighty was righteous as well as wise no true believer in the Bible will dare deny. And that this condition was, or included, that we now call slavery—the right of man to hold property in man—is proven by the special laws of Moses, which were, in all cases, conformable to the law of Mount Sinai.

The first statute, promulgated by the Hebrew lawgiver to the people, concerned slavery. Hebrew servitude was established by statute. This was the law of the man servant:

“Now these are the judgments which thou shalt set before them.

“If thou buy an Hebrew servant, six years he shall serve: and in the seventh he shall go out free for nothing.



"If he came in by himself, he shall go out by himself: if he were married, then his wife shall go out with him.

"If his master have given him a wife, and she have borne him sons or daughters, the wife and her children shall be her master's, and he shall go out by himself.

"And if the servant shall plainly say, I love my master, my wife, and my children; I will not go out free:

"Then his master shall bring him unto the judges: he shall also bring him to the door, or unto the door-post; and his master shall bore his ear through with an awl; and he shall serve him forever.—*Exodus, chap. 21, verses 2 to 7.*

In the second clause, the rule concerning children born in slavery of these Hebrew parents, the mother being free, is left unexplained. But in a recapitulation of these laws this ambiguity is entirely removed. After providing that the Hebrew man may be sold as a slave even to a stranger, but must be well treated, not as a bond servant but as a hired servant, and at the jubilee, the fiftieth year, then—

"Shall he depart from thee, both he and his children with him."—*Leviticus, chap. 25, 41.*

These laws in Exodus and Leviticus show three things or conditions:

*First.* A Hebrew man could sell himself, or be sold as a slave or servant, for six years, or till the jubilee; and if he had a wife and children they shared his lot and his liberation; but the daughters were never considered slaves.

*Second.* He could have but one wife, *thus establishing monogamy as the law of marriage in slavery.* If he had none when he became a slave, his master might give him a wife; and if there were children born, the wife and children continued with the master.

*Third.* The Hebrew man had a right to make himself a slave for life; the Hebrew woman was never permitted to become a slave. The Hebrew father reduced to poverty, who sold himself and family, could only sell his daughter to become a wife—either the wife of her master, or, if he were married, of his son. She was considered as betrothed, and was to be cared for as a daughter of the house. If the condition—honorable marriage—was not fulfilled, then the Hebrew maiden must be maintained like a daughter, or provided for in marriage with another man, or go out free. The Hebrew, who bought her, could not re-sell her.—(*Ex., chap. 21, verses 7—11.*)

Now, remember that these ordinances were from God, and for His chosen people. Were the laws unjust? unrighteous? Will you contend with the Almighty? Are you wiser than He? Will you say, as some of the advocates for "human freedom"

do, that "liberty is the inalienable right of men, and cannot be abrogated even by the consent of the individual who would become a slave?"

Why, those who assert this really abridge human liberty. The right to his time, after he comes of age, is surely one of the elementary rights of the freeman. If he has the right to engage, that is, sell himself or his services for six months, has he not the same right to sell himself for six years? or to make the contract during life? This last condition was strictly guarded in the law. The Hebrew man could not make a surrender of himself at once. Time was given, six years, wherein to test his master, who was also his brother Israelite. If then the Hebrew servant wished to become a slave for life, he was at liberty to choose his lot.

You may say the man who did this was a mean, miserable wretch: probably so; that makes the state he had chosen best for him. And you deprive him of this resource for comfort and improvement.

There was another class of slaves permitted the Hebrews. The law reads thus:

"Both thy bondmen and thy bondmaids, which thou shalt have, shall be of the heathen that are round about you; of them shall ye buy bondmen and bondmaids.

"Moreover, of the children of the strangers that do sojourn among you, of them shall ye buy, and of their families that are with you, which they begat in your land; and they shall be your possession.

"And ye shall take them as an inheritance for your children after you, to inherit them for a possession; they shall be your bondmen for ever: but over your brethren the children of Israel ye shall not rule one over another with rigor."—*Leviticus, chap. 25, verses 44, 47.*

These heathen were the direct descendants of Ham, through Canaan, the accursed. This race, the people of the land, had become utterly corrupt. Like Sodom, the whole population of Canaan, and the part of Syria given to the Israelites, was doomed. The country was ripe for destruction. Death by the sword, or slavery under the conquering race, was the merited punishment of these depraved human beings, who had sunk so low in their bestial sensualities and heaven-daring crimes that they could not be reformed.

What greater mercy could be bestowed on them than perpetual servitude, under masters who had the knowledge of the true God, and were bound, by the laws He had given them, to admit those slaves into the religious privileges of their own holy worship?

At the great feast of rejoicing, the "men-servants and the maid-servants" were to have place with the sons and daughters

of the Hebrew congregation; while no stranger or hired servant, not Hebrew, was permitted to come nigh.—*Deut.* 12, 12.

The priests, to whom a portion of the holy offerings pertained as food, were under a strict law on this score.

“There shall no stranger eat of the holy thing: a sojourner of the priest, or an hired servant, shall not eat of the holy thing.

“But if the priest buy any soul with his money, he shall eat of it, and he that is born in his house (of these slaves:) they shall eat of his meat.”—*Leviticus*, 22: 10, 11.

Here we are taught how closely the slave was identified with all the religious privileges of his master. The former could not fail of being instructed in the laws of God.

So, too, in the marriage relation; the law of monogamy was carefully guarded for the man-servant, as we have shown; it was the same with the maid-servant. If a Hebrew, among his captives, found a beautiful woman that he wished to have, he was allowed, after certain preliminaries, to marry her; he could not take her as a concubine; but if, after marriage, she did not please him, he could put her away by giving her freedom. He was not permitted to sell her, nor to make her a slave if she had been his wife.—*Deuteronomy*, 21: 11, 15.

In short, slavery to Hebrew masters, who were admonished by Moses to remember “that they had been bondmen in Egypt,” was the best condition in which the surrounding heathen people could be placed.

All these careful regulations, however, prove the fact, that personal servitude was clearly established under the Mosaic laws; the persons subjected to the penalty “forever” were the descendants of Ham or Canaan.

Burke defines *law* as “beneficence acting by rule.” Moral law, God-given law, must accord with this definition. But every law, whether divine or human, that establishes duties must have penalties. Obedience is the good to be obtained; and the punishments for disobedience to divine laws are and must be exactly proportioned to the necessity for obedience, in order to work out the good which the command is intended to effect.

Death is the greatest penalty the Mosaic laws inflict. No tortures were permitted. Death was the punishment for idolatry, disobedience (continued and obstinate) to parents, murder, adultery, and manstealing. This last statute referred to and confirmed the rights of the master and the rights of freemen.

That servitude, as established in the Hebrew commonwealth, was a beneficent institution for both servant and master, there can be no doubt, because God willed it. The laws promulgated for its regulation must also have been righteous, and the best

that could be framed and made effectual, in that period of the world, for the suppression of evil and the promotion of good.

Let us read them from the divine record :

“ And if a man smite his servant, or his maid, with a rod, and he die under his hand, he shall be surely punished.

“ Notwithstanding, if he continue a day or two, he shall not be punished; for he is his money.

“ And if a man smite the eye of his servant, or the eye of his maid, that it perish, he shall let him go free for his eye's sake.

“ And if he smite out his man-servant's tooth, or his maid-servant's tooth, he shall let him go free for his tooth's sake.”

“ If the ox shall push a man-servant, or a maid-servant; he shall give unto their master thirty shekels of silver, and the ox shall be stoned.”—(*Exodus*, chap. 21, verses 20, 21—26, 27—32.

These were laws for the government of the heathen servants whose bondage was to be “ forever.” Were the laws cruel? unjust?

Bear in mind that these slaves were of the race of Ham,\* and

\* In the record of Noah's sons the posterity of Canaan is thus enunciated :

“ And Canaan begat Sidon his first-born, and Heth.

“ And the Jebusite, and the Amorite, and the Girgasite.

“ And the Hivite, and the Arkite, and the Sinite.

“ And the Arvadite, and the Zemarite, and the Hamathite: and afterward were the families of the Canaanites spread abroad.

“ And the border of the Canaanites was from Sidon, as thou comest to Gerar, unto Gaza: as thou goest unto Sodom and Gomorrah, and Admah, and Zeboim, even unto Lasha.”—*Gen.*, chap. 10, verses 15 to 20.

Sodom and Gomorrah were destroyed for their wickedness in the time of Abraham. That the inhabitants of the land given to the Hebrews were utterly corrupt and doomed to die, Moses thus declares :

“ But thou shalt utterly destroy them, namely, the Hittites, and the Amorites, the Canaanites, and the Perizzites, the Hivites, and the Jebusites, as the Lord thy God hath commanded thee :

“ That they teach you not to do after all their abominations which they have done unto their gods; so should ye sin against the Lord your God.”—*Deuteronomy*, chap. 20, verse 17.

Joshua alludes several times to these different tribes, descendants of Canaan, who were to be destroyed or driven out, or made slaves. In his farewell speech to the Hebrew people, he thus enumerates the enemies they had overcome, as though speaking for the Lord God :

“ And ye went over Jordan, and came unto Jericho: and the men of Jericho fought against you, the Amorites, and the Perizzites, and the Canaanites, and the Hittites, and the Girgashites, the Hivites, and the Jebusites, and I delivered them into your hand.”—*Josh.*, chap. 24, ver. 11.

Thus surely does the Bible authority settle the question that the posterity of Canaan were desperately wicked, and must be either destroyed from the face of the earth or placed under the control of another race, descendants of Shem or Japheth.

only escaped utter destruction through this bondage. They had filled the land with wicked abominations, and were unfit to live; they must be controlled in order to be reformed.

Whoever will carefully and candidly examine the statutes of Moses cannot fail to see that the sentiment of kindness and mercy is constantly mingled with the just judgment against sins and crimes. It was forbidden to "muzzle the ox that treadeth out the corn;" or to "take the mother bird with its young in the nest;" or "seethe the kid in its mother's milk." It was sin to "curse the deaf;" or "lay a stumbling block before the blind," or in any way to wrong or "oppress the widow and the fatherless."

The Hebrews were enjoined to do no unrighteousness in judgment:

"Thou shalt not respect the person of the poor, nor honor the person of the mighty; but in righteousness shalt thou judge thy neighbor.

"Thou shalt not go up and down as a talebearer among thy people; neither stand against the blood of thy neighbor.

"Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself."—(See *Leviticus*, chapter 19; *Deuteronomy*, chapters 22 and 24.)

Did the holy God, who inspired all these wise, merciful, and harmonizing injunctions for the government of His chosen people—did he allow wrong to be done or sin committed by His laws of slavery?

In the name of American Christians, we answer, No. The system of servitude or slavery, established by Moses, was right and good; the laws that regulated it were wise and righteous.

And here we would call attention to one point in these laws, namely, that the property of the master in his bond-servant is not only acknowledged, but it is shown that this *ownership* is a great safeguard to the slave against cruelty and injustice. The loss of the servant falls on the master as a punishment.—(See *Exodus*, chap. 19, verse 21.)

The Hebrew servant was not subjected to these penalties. He was to be treated like a "hired servant," or "sojourner."\* The period of his service was limited; his ultimate freedom secured. He was sold and bought because he was poor and could not main-

\* "And if thy brother that dwelleth by thee be waxen poor, and be sold unto thee: thou shalt not compel him to serve as a bond-servant:

"But as an hired servant, and as a sojourner he shall be with thee, and shall serve thee unto the year of jubilee:

"And then shall he depart from thee, both he and his children with him, and shall return unto his own family, and unto the possession of his fathers shall he return.

"For they are my servants which I brought forth out of the land of Egypt; they shall not not be sold as bond-men.

"Thou shalt not rule over him with rigor, but shalt fear God."—*Leviticus*, 25: 39 to 43.

tain himself, but he escaped imprisonment for debt, or the debasement of the almshouse. And when his time of freedom (the seventh year, or the jubilee) came, he took his former place in all his relations of life. These facts show that slavery, of itself, is not sin, nor crime, nor wrong; but that it was imposed as a penalty by Moses to prevent or punish sin and crime and wrong.

The laws of Moses did not allow those monstrous evils of modern Christian civilization—pauperism, and penitentiaries. Yet his legislation provided for the employment of both free and slave labor. Both were made legal for the tribes; both kinds were brought together and maintained under all the changes of the Hebrew government, throughout the whole period of Jewish nationality, from the great LAWGIVER to the greater LAW EXPOUNDER, and never a word of rebuke or an accusation of evil results is recorded in the Bible against this system of free and slave labor.

As another proof showing the care taken to prevent wrong to masters, to servants, and to free citizens, we will cite the law concerning *man-stealing* :

“He that stealeth a man and selleth him, or if he be found in his hand, he shall surely be put to death.” (*Ex. chap. 21, verse 16.*)

This statute was promulgated immediately after that of Hebrew servitude, showing that there was then established the relation of master or *owner*, and bought servant or *property*. The man taken away must be in this condition, or liable to it, otherwise he could not have been stolen. A hired servant would not be thus guarded.

That the law was good and worked well, we have the testimony of Moses. Forty years after its enactment he thus reiterates it :

“If a man be found stealing any of his brethren of the children of Israel, and maketh merchandise of him, or selleth him; then that thief shall die; and thou shalt put evil away from among you.”—*Deut., chap. 24, verse 7.*

The punishment of death is not, by the laws of Moses, imposed for any theft except this of *stealing a Hebrew*, either from his master, or to sell. The rights of the servant to his freedom on the seventh year, or at the jubilee, were guarded by this severe law; also, the right of the master to the services of his servant for the specified period were as strictly guarded.

Whether the death punishment was inflicted for stealing a heathen servant, whose bondage was fixed and “forever,” we are not told; but as the right of property in them was complete, it is not probable that the theft was made a capital crime. The relation between the Hebrew master and servant, being exalted

by the ties of blood and religious faith, was more sacred than bond service. It came next after the nearest family relationship.

The Israelites were the servants of God. The posterity of Canaan, the son of Ham, were to be drawn to God through their servitude to the posterity of Shem and Japheth. Hence these slaves were unspeakably benefited by being sold from their heathen to their Hebrew masters. Hence we find immunities guaranteed to the slaves who, escaping from heathen masters, threw themselves on the charity of God's people.

"Thou shalt not deliver unto his master the servant which is escaped from his master unto thee:

"He shall dwell with thee, even among you in that place which he shall choose in one of thy gates where it liketh him best."—*Deuteronomy, chap. 23, verses 15, 16.*

No Biblical commentator nor honest expositor has ever interpreted this statute as having any bearing on the bondmen of the Hebrews, encouraging those to run from one tribe to another, in order to be free.

Moses had settled the law of heathen servitude and reaffirmed the right of the Hebrew master to hold those "bought with his money" in bondage "forever." He would not thus stultify his own enactments, nor destroy the internal harmony of the tribes. If he had done this, the history of his people would be sure to show the turmoil it raised.

But it was merciful thus to protect, by solemn pledge, those who, as strangers, voluntarily came to place themselves under the Hebrew government. The law making man-stealing a capital crime was also needed to protect these and other exiles in their freedom; because the Hebrew commonwealth was slaveholding.

Thus surely and unequivocally was servitude, both Hebrew and heathen, established and regulated by the laws of Moses, and never revoked by any subsequent statute, nor set aside by any usage or declaration recorded in the Old Testament.

We meet references to this domestic institution in all the sacred books, from Genesis to Malachi, and never a censure or reproof of the system of slavery itself, and but very rarely any rebuke of those particular sins which might be ascribed to, or be developed by, this state of society.

The wrongs against the poor working classes, forbidden by the laws of Moses, and condemned by inspired prophecy, were those committed against *hired servants* and other classes of the poor who have none to care for them, such as widows, orphans, captives, and strangers. The slave or bondman, among the Hebrews, had always a protector in his master.

In nearly every case where heathen bondage is alluded to, the glimpses given us show it to have been good both for master and servant. Let us read over a few of these brief sketches from the oracles of divine truth; it may serve to calm the feelings and enlighten the mind of many a true Christian now seeking for light on the exciting subject of slavery in our own country. Is it not a duty to study well the Bible record before we condemn as *sin* what God has ordained and justified?

Job, who must have been a very large slaveholder, and who reckons it among his great sorrows that he had lost them—"I called my servant, and he gave no answer;" see chap. 19, verse 16—thus urges that kindness and justice to servants were considered the distinguishing virtues of a good man:

"If I did despise the cause of my man-servant or of my maid-servant, when they contended with me:

"What then shall I do when God riseth up? and when he visiteth, what shall I answer him?

"Did not he that made me in the womb make him? and did not one fashion us in the womb?"—*Job, chap. 31, verses 13, 14, 15. (Read the whole chapter.)*

Yet Job says nothing against slaveholding; he only shows that having bond-servants, like power, wealth, and other distinctions which a man may lawfully hold, he is answerable for the manner in which he uses all these blessings.

David thus pictures the trust of the slave in the kindness and power of the slaveholder:

"Behold, as the eyes of servants look unto the hand of their masters, and as the eyes of a maiden unto the hand of her mistress; so our eyes wait upon the Lord our God, until that he have mercy upon us.—*Psalms 123, verse 2.*

What a wonderful ascription of praise to the love and tenderness of the good master and mistress!

In Proverbs many allusions are made to servants, showing how the system of domestic slavery was inwoven with the whole Jewish polity; yet not a single reproach is launched against slaveholding, which, as Solomon's precepts are eminently practical, and must be wise and true, because inspired, proves that the institution was neither wrong nor injurious to the Hebrew nation.

"He that is despised, and hath a servant, is better than he that honoreth himself, and lacketh bread."—*Proverbs, chap. 12, verse 9.*

"A wise servant shall have rule over a son that causeth shame, and shall have part of the inheritance among the brethren."—*Chap. 17: 2.*

"A servant will not be corrected by words: for though he understand he will not answer."



"He that delicately bringeth up his servant from a child shall have him become his son at the length."—*Chapter 29, verses 19, 21.*

"Accuse not a servant unto his master, lest he curse thee, and thou be found guilty."—*Chap. 30: 10.*

"For a servant when he reigneth, the earth is disquieted."—*Chapter 30, verses 21, 22.*

Malachi, the last of the prophets, thus bears testimony to the good influences that pervade the household where servitude is a permanent state, like the relation of parent and child:

"A son honoreth his father, and a servant his master: if then I be a father, where is mine honor? and if I be a master, where is my fear? saith the Lord of hosts unto you, O priests, that despise my name."—*Malachi, chap. 1, v. 6.*

There is still another proof that slavery cannot be sin of itself any more than poverty, sickness, degradation, and other penalties, physical and moral, that the crimes and vices of men bring on themselves and their posterity.

The Hebrew people, for their national sins, were, by their law, doomed to terrible evils and sufferings; one of these punishments was *servitude to heathen masters*. Surely and sorely was this sentence fulfilled. From their first bondage, about sixty years after the death of Joshua, when "the Lord sold them into the hand of the king of Mesopotamia, and they served him eight years,"\* until the Hebrew polity was broken up, and the king and people of Judea carried into Babylonish servitude, (the kingdom of Israel had been enslaved previously.) The whole history of this rebellious race is filled with their sins and punishments; the ultimate result of their idolatries and disobedience to God's law was *bondage to heathen masters*.

And it is very apparent that this bondage or slavery, more than any other punishment, brought those rebellious Hebrews to repentance and reformation. It did them good and not evil. It was the discipline they needed. It acted precisely as just judgment on the criminal is now intended to act. The criminal must be subjected to the penalty of the statute he has violated, or he will have no respect for the majesty of law, and would never reform; and he must be placed in a condition that not only restrains him from committing the crime for which he is punished, but allows him opportunity of repentance, or he would have no hope for the future.

Is it "horribly wrong" that human law should punish men for

---

\* See Judges 3: 8. The Hebrews were *servants* of the Lord; and "the Lord sold them" into slavery! Mark the language, and the punishment for sin.

sins and crimes by sending them into servitude in penitentiaries, penal settlements, prisons? Do we say of these abridgments of "human freedom," often for life, that they are "damnably wrong?"

And has not God, who created man and gave him whatever of "rights and liberties" he enjoys, the just right to abridge the freedom of any portion of his creatures, or take it away entirely, if He sees that the righteousness of His holy law demands this punishment for their sins?

*"Cursed be Canaan; a servant of servants shall he be unto his brethren."*

While that sentence stands on the Bible record as the revealed judgment of the Lord God against a race of sinners; and while this sentence is corroborated by the requirements of His Moral Law, and carried into effect by the statutes He inspired for the government of His chosen people, the charge that "slavery is sin," "the sum of all villainies," "damnably wrong," is no other than denouncing the righteousness of God, and charging Him with injustice and sin.

That the institution of slavery was established in the Hebrew Commonwealth no Christian can deny; that it was continued, under all the changes of Government and nationality till the end of the Old Testament, we have conclusively shown. Nor is there in this long history of the moral and civil life of the people for *eleven hundred years*, a single record that denounces slavery as evil, or that charges the wickedness of the people to this source, or that threatens them with punishment for sins imputed to this institution. Two instances only occur, where the *law of Hebrew slavery*, which was incidental and limited, had been violated; and these are severely condemned.

The first instance is related in the Book of Nehemiah, chapter 5. The second is found in Jeremiah, chapter 34; verses 8 to the end. But slavery is not condemned. On the contrary, the bondage of the heathen to their Hebrew masters is constantly brought out by the sacred writers, always without rebuke, and often in a manner that shows it to have been good for both master and servant.

This result every *Christian* is compelled to believe, because no man nor woman can be a *Christian* who rejects the divine authority of the Scriptures or imputes unrighteousness to God.

The question, then, is settled. Personal servitude, an institu-

tion of involuntary bondage, where the servant was the *property*\* of his master, could be bought and sold, and held as “a possession forever;” as “an inheritance for your children after you”—such slavery for the heathen Canaanites was and is sanctioned by the authority of the Old Testament.

Was this law of personal servitude condemned, reversed, set aside, by the later authority of the New Testament ?

Let us examine the Gospel.

---

\* Property is held by many tenures. This right of property in persons was the right of the master to the services of his bondsmen, and held by and from the appointment of the Most Highest. The law should be productive of good to both parties.

## PART II.

## IS SLAVERY SANCTIONED BY THE NEW TESTAMENT?

In the Gospel of Jesus Christ, American abolitionists, who profess to believe the Bible, insist that the revocation of the Mosaic statutes concerning slavery, may be found.

Where?

The Gospel brought "peace on earth, and good will to the children of men;" that is, it brought the announcement, the hope, the light, and the way for these glorious blessings: but not a word is said of "personal freedom," of "human rights," of "political privileges."

The whole scope of our Lord's teachings was to convince men, *all men*, of sin, and bring all to repentance. Christ never meddled with secular authorities. He freed men from the bondage of Satan, from the chains of sin, from the prison-house of wicked delusions, where in darkness and despair they were lying bound, bruised, starving, naked, and loathsome with the festering soul and body diseases of sickness and of death, eternal, as well as temporal.

If the Saviour had been sent to open, literally, the prison doors to those placed there by human authority, why did He not free John the Baptist, who was unjustly confined?

"My kingdom is not of this world," was His declaration.

Had Jesus Christ accepted the governments of all the earth, which the devil urged upon Him, then He would doubtless have rectified what was wrong; but He would not accept.

He went about preaching the Gospel of personal repentance and eternal salvation by the Son of God, doing good, all the while, to the poor, the oppressed, and afflicted; but never counseling them to demand from men the redress of their grievances.

He had disciples in all ranks, though most among the lowly. He did not alter the personal condition of a single believer. He sought only to purify the heart, exalt the hope, and set men free from sin. He never interfered with the civil government, nor with questions pertaining to the public relations of his hearers. He dealt with the individual man in his conjugal, parental, family, and neighborly feelings and interests; in each and all of

these He urged the law of holiness and love. "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and thy neighbor as thyself."

"Ah, yes!" cries the abolitionist, "that is the very matter! The slaveholder would not be a slave himself, therefore he should free all his slaves. He should do as he would be done by."

Are you sure you have given the right interpretation? You have a hundred thousand dollars; you are rich. Here is your poor hired servant, who wants half your money. You would not be a poor hired servant. Will you give him one-half of your gold, and equalize your conditions? If he was in your place and you in his, would you desire him to give you one-half of his money? Would you think it unchristian if he did not?

The explanation of this duty to our neighbor is given by the Saviour himself, in the parable of the man that fell among thieves.\* It is to help those that need, and to have pity upon the afflicted, as you would hope to be helped, if you, like them, were in trouble. It does not teach the relinquishment of our just rights, or the giving up what belongs to us. The good Samaritan did not leave his "beast" to the poor man, nor buy him any raiment, nor divide his purse with him. He simply "had compassion" on the wounded traveler, and helped him for the time, and left a pledge that he would do more if it were needed; but he had the right to expect that the wounded man would exert himself to the utmost not to be chargeable to his benefactor. That was the neighborly duty of the man who had been helped.

I have dwelt at length on this parable of our Saviour, because it is the only portion of His teachings which has any bearing

\* "A certain man went down from Jerusalem to Jericho, and fell among thieves, which stripped him of his raiment, and wounded him, and departed, leaving him half dead.

"And by chance there came down a certain priest that way; and when he saw him, he passed by on the other side.

"And likewise a Levite, when he was at the place, came and looked on him, and passed by on the other side.

"But a certain Samaritan, as he journeyed, came where he was; and when he saw him, he had compassion on him,

"And went to him, and bound up his wounds, pouring in oil and wine, and set him on his own beast, and brought him to an inn, and took care of him.

"And on the morrow when he departed, he took out two pence, and gave them to the host, and said unto him, Take care of him: and whatsoever thou spendest more, when I come again, I will repay thee.

"Which now of these three, thinkest thou, was neighbor unto him that fell among the thieves?

"And he said, He that shewed mercy on him. Then said Jesus<sup>u</sup> unto him, Go, and do thou likewise."—*Luke, chap. 10, verses 30—37.*

on the argument that slavery was abrogated by the Gospel. Servitude, or slavery, is no more abrogated than was the kingly government, or the civil institutions, or municipal rights, or official dignities. The Gospel was offered equally to all men. Whoever accepted was released from the bonds of sin, made free in the spirit, united in the brotherhood of all true believers, was entitled to a heavenly inheritance, and had, over his redeemed soul, no master save Christ. Yet he might have been one of the poorest and most abject of all the dwellers at Jerusalem. His social position mattered not. The slave of a Pharisee, if converted by the teachings of the Saviour, would have been an heir of eternal glory in the life to come, but in this life would have remained the bond-servant of his earthly master.

No person who has read the New Testament will assert that the Saviour ever openly rebuked the masters of slaves; and these must often have been present at His teachings. He never, by precept or parable, classed *slavery—the right of one man to hold another man as personal property, which the Jewish law allowed*—among the sins of the rich, covetous, selfish, unrighteous men whom He condemned for the specified sins of licentiousness, cruelty, hypocrisy, and oppression.

Was not this very strange, if slavery be “the sum of all villainies?”

Ought not He, who knew the heart of man and the importance of all the just restraints of moral law, ought He not to have warned the world against this system, if it be “utterly incompatible with Christianity?”

Not only did Jesus Christ not do this, but He has left His own holy approval of the good slaveholder on record. He has drawn a picture of slavery which shows not only its lawfulness, but its righteousness, and exemplifies the manner in which it should be conducted.

There are two important parables in the Gospel of St. Matthew, which have never, as we believe, been considered in their application to earthly duties as well as to heavenly hopes. The “parable of the vineyard” is one of these. It was given to illustrate the justice and the free grace of God. It does so, and moreover, it teaches the rights and duties of property holders and “free” or hired laborers. We will give the text, because we can never study the sacred Word too carefully:

“For the kingdom of heaven is like unto a man that is a householder, which went out early in the morning to hire laborers into his vineyard.

“And when he had agreed with the laborers for a penny a day, he sent them into his vineyard.

“And he went out about the third hour, and saw others standing idle in the market-place,

"And said unto them: Go ye also into the vineyard, and whatsoever is right I will give you. And they went their way.

"Again he went out about the sixth and ninth hour, and did likewise.

"And about the eleventh hour he went out, and found others standing idle, and saith unto them, Why stand ye here all the day idle?

"They say unto him, Because no man hath hired us. He saith unto them, Go ye also into the vineyard; and whatsoever is right, that shall ye receive.

"So when even was come, the lord of the vineyard saith unto his steward, Call the laborers, and give them their hire, beginning from the last unto the first.

"And when they came that were hired about the eleventh hour, they received every man a penny.

"But when the first came, they supposed that they should have received more; and they likewise received every man a penny.

"And when they had received it, they murmured against the good man of the house,

"Saying, These last have wrought but one hour, and thou hast made them equal unto us, which have borne the burden and heat of the day.

"But he answered one of them, and said, Friend, I do thee no wrong: didst thou not agree with me for a penny?

"Take that thine is, and go thy way; I will give unto this last, even as unto thee.

"Is it not lawful for me to do what I will with mine own? Is thine eye evil, because I am good?

"So the last shall be first, and the first last; for many be called, but few chosen."—*St. Matthew, chap. 20, verses 1 to 17.*

Does not this parable condemn the fallacy of all agrarian theories, and show the wickedness of that communist philosophy which is based on the robbery of the rich in order to endow the poor, so that human conditions may be equalized?

Jesus Christ taught the responsibility of each individual to do *justly*, no matter what was his condition. The poor hired laborer in the vineyard was as surely bound by this law to be content with his penny, for which he had agreed—the market price—as the rich householder was to pay him the penny. The conditions of justice are equal.

We are required by the Gospel to love our neighbor as ourselves; but we are not required, as this parable shows, to measure that love by our neighbor's standard of wants or demands. Because those poor hired servants wanted more than their just due, it did not follow that the rich householder was wrong in resisting their demands. True, he had the means of giving; and he was responsible to God for the manner in which he used his talents or wealth. Charity must be free, otherwise it is not mercy. He acted freely.

Here, then, is the standard for employers and hired servants: "*to deal justly*" always. This is the duty of both parties. The rich employer must do more; he has more; he must "*love mercy*;" while to "*walk humbly with God*" is the duty of all men.

The other parable which we shall quote shows the rights and duties of master and bond-servant. We entreat our readers to study its teachings with attention and reverence :

"Therefore is the kingdom of heaven likened unto a certain king, which would take account of his servants.

"And when he had begun to reckon, one was brought unto him, which owed him ten thousand talents.

"But forasmuch as he had not to pay, his lord commanded him to be sold, and his wife, and children, and all that he had, and payment to be made.

"The servant therefore fell down, and worshipped him, saying, Lord, have patience with me, and I will pay thee all.

"Then the lord of that servant was moved with compassion, and loosed him, and forgave him the debt.

"But the same servant went out, and found one of his fellow-servants, which owed him a hundred pence : and he laid hands on him, and took him by the throat, saying, Pay me that thou owest.

"And his fellow-servant fell down at his feet, and besought him, saying, Have patience with me, and I will pay thee all.

"And he would not : but went and cast him into prison, till he should pay the debt.

"So when his fellow-servants saw what was done, they were very sorry, and came and told unto their lord all that was done.

"Then his lord, after that he had called him, said unto him, O thou wicked servant, I forgave thee all that debt, because thou desiredst me :

"Shouldst not thou also have had compassion on thy fellow-servant, even as I had pity on thee ?

"And his lord was wroth, and delivered him to the tormentors, till he should pay all that was due unto him.

"So likewise shall my heavenly Father do also unto you, if ye from your hearts forgive not every one his brother their trespasses."—*St. Matthew, chap. 18, verse 23 to close.*

This parable, given by the Saviour to teach the duty of forgiveness among Christian brethren—as God, their king and master forgives them—is exemplified by that of an earthly master who owned his servants—in other words, a slaveholder, having the right of selling his people. If this king, (or master, one who has sovereign power, that of ownership is the meaning of the Greek,) could righteously sell his servant, then to buy must have been equally just as well as legal.

Now bond-service in domestic life was an institution in the Hebrew polity, familiar from the time of Abraham, sanctioned by the moral law, incorporated into the Mosaic code, and its lawfulness or expediency had never been questioned.

Did not Jesus Christ know well the meaning of the language He used ? He knew the human heart. Did He not know that His words, fairly interpreted, mean that a true believer in Christ, a Christian, in the highest sense of that holy term, may righteously hold slaves, and order their earthly destiny, subject only to that "higher law"—or rather, LAW OF THE MOST HIGHEST, which



enjoins justice always, and mercy and forgiveness, as we hope for Heaven?

This king (or slaveholder) is represented as a man faultless towards his servants. He had granted this very servant (or slave) many and great privileges, even forgiving him (or canceling) a large debt; but he had not made him free. Does not the result show us that that "wicked servant" was not fit for freedom? That he must be subjected to the authority of a *master*, or he would injure and destroy *his equals*—his fellow-servants?

If "slavery is a sin against God and man, founded on injustice and cruelty," is it not passing strange that Jesus Christ should have chosen this system of master and bond-servant as representing the relation subsisting between God the Father and those who are forgiven and accepted of Him? Can we see no resemblance, no analogy? Are not believers the servants of God?—"bought with a price"—even the precious blood of His Son, whose "obedience unto death" was required to free them from slavery to sin? Does not our divine Master grant us privileges, that glorious one of being called after His name—*Christians*? These Christians are bound to obey His laws, or they must, assuredly, suffer punishment.

It was thus that the disciples of Christ were instructed to understand this parable. They could never have inferred that "slavery was the sin to be throttled;" they would feel that good servants were in danger of being *throttled*, were "*taken by the throat*," when wicked servants had power.

This parable settles two important questions bearing on negro slavery in the United States, namely: that in bondage the marriage relation should be held sacred; and that families should be sold together.

"He commanded him to be sold, and his wife and children."—*Matthew*, 18: 25.

We learn also from this parable, as well as from other teachings of Christ and His apostles, that bond-service was a condition which brought master and servant into nearer domestic intimacy of dependence and protection, than hired service ever can do. This protection to an inferior race is a high privilege, and may be made, to both master and servant, the means of great blessings, temporal and spiritual.

As if to body forth this idea to His followers, and teach them that the lowest menial services did not degrade the soul, nor hinder the grace of God, but rather offered opportunity of spiritual improvement, Christ not only took "on Him the form of a servant," but He performed the lowest office of a slave, when

"He girded Himself with a towel" and "washed the feet of His disciples."

It should be always borne in mind that the Bible nowhere represents slavery as sinful; but as a condition resulting from sin, as did the condition of hard labor, poverty, disease, and all the evils that flesh is heir to, even death itself, result from sin. Those who are born in the condition of slaves or of slaveholders are neither of them responsible for the place they hold in the world, but only for the manner in which they fulfil its duties. This is conclusively taught by the parable of the talents.\*

Here again our blessed Lord represents the "kingdom of heaven" by a master and bond-servants—his "own servants;" they belonged to their lord; he could command them, reward

\* "For the kingdom of heaven is as a man traveling into a far country, who called his own servants, and delivered unto them his goods.

"And unto one he gave five talents, to another two, and to another one; to every man according to his several ability; and straightway took his journey.

"Then he that had received the five talents went and traded with the same, and made them other five talents.

"And likewise he that had received two, he also gained other two.

"But he that had received one went and digged in the earth, and hid his lord's money.

"After a long time the lord of those servants cometh, and reckoneth with them.

"And so he that had received five talents came and brought other five talents, saying, Lord, thou deliveredst unto me five talents: behold, I have gained beside them five talents more.

"His lord said unto him, Well done, thou good and faithful servant; thou hast been faithful over a few things, I will make thee ruler over many things; enter thou into the joy of thy lord.

"He also that had received two talents came and said, Lord, thou deliveredst unto me two talents; behold, I have gained two other talents beside them.

"His lord said unto him, Well done, good and faithful servant; thou hast been faithful over a few things, I will make thee ruler over many things; enter thou into the joy of thy lord.

"Then he which had received the one talent came and said, Lord, I knew thee that thou art a hard man, reaping where thou hast not sown, and gathering where thou hast not strewed;

"And I was afraid, and went and hid thy talent in the earth; lo, there thou hast that is thine.

"His lord answered and said unto him, Thou wicked and slothful servant, thou knewest that I reap where I sowed not, and gather where I have not strewed;

"Thou oughtest therefore to have put my money to the exchangers, and then at my coming I should have received mine own with usury.

"Take therefore the talent from him, and give it unto him which hath ten talents.

"For unto every one that hath shall be given, and he shall have abundance; but from him that hath not shall be taken away even that which he hath.

"And cast ye the unprofitable servant into outer darkness; there shall be weeping and gnashing of teeth."—*St. Matthew, chap. 25, verses 14 to 30.*

them, punish them, as he saw fit. To one he gave ten talents; to another five; to another one. Each must improve what he receives; all are accountable in proportion. Such is the equality the Gospel sets forth.

The liberty the Gospel proclaimed was freedom from the bondage of Satan; but the disciple must always bear the yoke of Christ. Nowhere does He preach or teach what is now called "personal freedom"—that is, the right to disobey laws, either of God or man, if they do not suit us. Christ's example, the yoke His followers must wear, was always obedience to law, even unto death.

The apostles, who certainly knew how to expound the principles of the Gospel as truly as any man, be he priest or layman, can do it at this day, are all agreed on this point. "Bringing every thought to the obedience of Christ" was the proof of repentance unto salvation that Paul pressed on his Gentile converts. The condition of master and bond-servant, or slave, then prevailed throughout the world; it was an institution, like our own, inwoven into the domestic relations of society in every nation on earth, and Paul must have met with it everywhere that he taught and established churches.

Would not Paul, who was so zealous in his Master's cause, have rebuked slavery, if it had been sin? He has brought the subject before two churches and two bishops. Let us read what he has written; and first, to the Church of the Ephesians:

"Servants, be obedient to them that are your masters according to the flesh, with fear and trembling, in singleness of your heart, as unto Christ:

"Not with eye-service, as men-pleasers: but as the servants of Christ, doing the will of God from the heart;

"With good will doing service, as to the Lord, and not to men:

"Knowing that whatsoever good thing any man doeth, the same shall he receive of the Lord, whether he be bond or free.

"And, ye masters, do the same things unto them, forbearing threatening: knowing that your Master also is in heaven: neither is there respect of persons with him."—*Ephesians*, chap. 6, ver. 5—10.

These are Paul's counsels to the Colossians:

"Servants, obey in all things your masters according to the flesh; not with eye-service, as men-pleasers: but in singleness of heart, fearing God:

"And whatsoever ye do, do it heartily, as to the Lord, and not unto men:

"Knowing that of the Lord ye shall receive the reward of the inheritance; for ye serve the Lord Christ.

"But he that doeth wrong shall receive for the wrong which he hath done: and there is no respect of persons.

"Masters, give unto your servants that which is just and equal: knowing that ye also have a Master in heaven."—*Colos.*, chap. 3, verse 22—25; chap. 4, verse 1.

Thus Paul instructed the churches. Is there any abolition of

slavery in his teachings? Any appeal to the slaves to "take their freedom at all hazards?" Any hint to the masters that to hold a fellow Christian in bondage is a "damnable wrong?" Strange that Paul did not give one word of censure to the slaveholder, if his household was arranged on sinful principles. And still more, strange that in his charge to the young bishop, Timothy, whom Paul, loving him as his own son, ought to have guided into the way of righteousness and love, the great Apostle has given commands concerning this "peculiar institution" which place it among the conditions of life that Timothy was zealously to watch over and sustain.

"Let as many servants as are under the yoke count their own masters worthy of all honor, that the name of God and his doctrine be not blasphemed.

"And they that have believing masters, let them not despise them, because they are brethren; but rather do them service, because they are faithful and beloved, partakers of the benefit. These things teach and exhort.

"If any man teach otherwise, and consent not to wholesome words, even the words of our Lord Jesus Christ, and to the doctrine which is according to godliness;

"He is proud, knowing nothing, but doting about questions and strifes of words, whereof cometh envy, strife, railings, evil surmisings,

"Perverse disputings of men of corrupt minds, and destitute of the truth, supposing that gain is godliness: from such withdraw thyself."—*1st Timothy, chap 6, verses 1—6.*

In the Epistle to Titus, bishop of the Church of the Cretians, similar directions are enforced with that earnestness which shows Paul had no scruple concerning the righteousness of the relation between master and bond-servant; that the latter, in doing his duty faithfully, was serving God; *obedience* to the master was Christian duty:

"Exhort servants to be obedient unto their own masters, and to please them well in all things; not answering again;

"Not purloining, but showing all good fidelity; that they may adorn the doctrine of God our Saviour in all things.

"For the grace of God that bringeth salvation hath appeared to all men,

"Teaching us that, denying ungodliness and worldly lusts, we should live soberly, righteously, and godly in this present world;

"Looking for that blessed hope, and the glorious appearing of the great God and our Saviour Jesus Christ;

"Who gave himself for us, that he might redeem us from all iniquity, and purify unto himself a peculiar people, zealous of good works.

"These things speak and exhort, and rebuke with all authority. Let no man despise thee."—*Titus, chap. 2: 9—15.*

Nor did the teachings of Paul end here. His whole epistle to Philemon was called forth by this subject of slavery. Paul had converted a runaway slave belonging to *Philemon*, a member of the Church at Ephesus. Tradition records that Philemon was a man of high birth, rich and powerful, whom St. Paul had con-

verted to the Christian faith. *Onesimus*, the slave of this rich Ephesian, had escaped from bondage and fled to Rome; there Paul, while a prisoner himself, converted this fugitive; and then—what?

Did Paul tell *Onesimus* that personal slavery was a degrading service, contrary to God's law, and to the Gospel of Jesus Christ? that all slaves had the "inalienable right of liberty," and should gain it if they had to commit all the crimes of the decalogue? What did Paul do?

He persuaded the fugitive slave, now an humble Christian, to return to his Christian master; he, Paul, writing, as he says, "with mine own hand," a tender letter to Philemon, to beg him to forgive, receive, and treat kindly the returned servant; and *Onesimus* was bearer of the letter!\*

The doctrine of St. Peter is, if possible, more decisive on this subject of the duty of servants than that of St. Paul. The former does not lay any injunction on masters; and his epistle is general for all churches.

"Servants, be subject to your masters with all fear; not only to the good and gentle, but also to the froward.

"For this is thankworthy, if a man for conscience toward God endure grief, suffering wrongfully.

"For what glory is it, if, when ye be buffeted for your faults, ye shall take it patiently? but if, when ye do well, and suffer for it, ye take it patiently, this is acceptable with God.

"For even hereunto were ye called: because Christ also suffered for us, leaving us an example, that ye should follow his steps:

"Who ~~did~~ no sin, neither was guile found in his mouth:

"Who, when he was reviled, reviled not again; when he suffered, he threatened not; but committed himself to him that judgeth righteously:

"Who his own self bare our sins in his own body on the tree, that we, being dead to sins, should live unto righteousness: by whose stripes ye were healed.

"For ye were as sheep going astray; but are now returned unto the Shepherd and Bishop of your souls."—1 *Pet.*, 2: 18.

\* Because St. Paul has, in many places, alluded to his own "bonds," it has been attempted to identify these expressions with the bonds of the slave. But this is utterly untenable. "Remember them that are in *bonds*, as bound with them;" "Others had trials of *bonds* and imprisonments;" "Wherein I suffer trouble, even to *bonds*;" "Ye had compassion of me in my *bonds*;" "For which I am in *bonds*," and similar expressions of his sufferings in the cause of Christ abound in the epistles; but will any true *believer* in the Bible say that these refer to bond-service—the holding of men in slavery—and condemn it? The apostle was alluding to his own imprisonments, unjust persecutions for his religious belief: and mark it well, ye who attempt to justify, by false witness against your southern brethren, robbery, rebellion, murder, because St. Paul asked the kindly sympathy of his Christian friends—not their interference to annoy or destroy those he complained of;—mark it well, he has commanded, by the inspiration of God: "Servants, be obedient to them that are your masters according to the flesh, with fear and trembling, in singleness of heart, as unto Christ."

I have given the commands and reasons of the apostles in full, because few persons will take the trouble to look out a passage in the Bible from the mere reference.

It is well to know, truly, what was taught as Gospel by the apostles. Did they teach abolition or anti-slavery in the manner now so popular among certain sects of Christians, so called?

Do those denunciators of American slavery find in the Word of God examples or doctrines to sustain and justify their violent invectives? Can they find Bible authority for this? or Bible authority, when they insist on placing polygamy and slavery on the same ground of opposition to the laws of God? or rather affirming the two conditions to have been treated in the same ambiguous manner by the inspired writers?

We affirm that such assertions are false, both to the letter and the spirit of God's laws.

Slavery was inflicted as a curse for sin on a certain portion of mankind.

Monogamy, the marriage of one man with one woman, was the blessing for the race that made Eden a paradise.

Slavery was never in any way, nor by any word, forbidden in God's laws; it was recognized in the law on Mount Sinai; provided for and perpetuated by the Mosiac code; never prohibited in the teachings of Jesus Christ, either in parable or precept, but justified and enforced; and it was acknowledged and made consonant with Christian duty by the apostles.

On the other hand, polygamy was utterly prohibited by the marriage law of Eden, that made the wedded pair *one*; it was absolutely forbidden on Mount Sinai, in the seventh commandment; most scathingly rebuked by the teachings of Jesus Christ, who reaffirmed the marriage law of Eden in a manner that shows it was never set aside, that it could not have been set aside without breaking the seventh commandment; and polygamy was authoritatively forbidden by the apostles to their Gentile converts. The Hebrews knew that the laws of Moses were made for a people whose usages in marriages were one man with one woman,\* like our own, after the example of Isaac and Rebecca.

The two systems, therefore, had not the same origin, nor can they be classed together in a single result.

If slavery, the bond-service that makes one man the property

---

\* This is proven by the law of Moses, which required the marriage of a childless widow to her deceased husband's brother. The law supposes that a man can leave only *one* widow; which could never be counted on in a nation of polygamists.

of another, be thus sanctioned by God's Word, both in the Old and New Testaments, is it to continue till the end of time? Is it to be in the millennium?

We cannot answer that question from the Bible, except so far as this: while men are subjected to the penalty of hard labor for bread, and women to the penalty of obedience, each wife to her own husband, we do not see why the penalty that subjected the posterity of Ham to slavery should be remitted.

"Cursed be Canaan; a servant of servants shall he be unto his brethren"—is peremptory, and as unlimited respecting time as the sentence on our first parents. In Revelation, *chap* 6, *ver.* 15, "*bondman and freeman*" flee together from the wrath of God; both are sinners.

In the prophetic books, where allusions are made to the millennium, God's chosen people are represented as having servants, who perform the duties of bond-service.

"For the Lord will have mercy on Jacob, and will yet choose Israel, and set them in their own land; and the strangers shall be joined with them, and they shall cleave to the house of Jacob.

"And the people shall take them, and bring them to their place; and the house of Israel shall possess them in the land of the Lord for servants and handmaids; and they shall take them captives, whose captives they were; and they shall rule over their oppressors."—*Isaiah, chap.* 14, *verses* 1, 2.

We thus learn that Israel, when restored at the millennium, will have the right to hold bond-servants, and that they will hold them. The holy prophet does not tell the people of God to give the strangers that follow them equal rights and privileges with themselves. Now, if thus to hold even their enemies in bondage had been "sin of itself," "the sum of all villanies," would it have been thus prophetically, or symbolically, if you please, accorded to God's people as a privilege? as a sign of the Lord's mercy? The like privileges and blessings are promised to Israel, in chapters 60, verse 10, and 61, verse 5—*Isaiah*:

"And the sons of strangers shall build up thy walls, and their kings shall minister unto thee."

"And strangers shall stand and feed your flocks, and the sons of the alien shall be your ploughmen and your vine-dressers."

We might quote a multitude of other texts which show that domestic slavery was an established condition of social life, recognized throughout the whole period of Bible history, and never, in a single instance, condemned as wrong in itself, as a sin, *per se*. Therefore we do not know how any Christian can deny this proposition: *Slavery is sanctioned by the Bible.*

But how shall we reconcile this difference of condition among men with the doctrine of "equal rights" which our political teachers enunciate?

The Bible settles it all. The parable of the talents is the true code of the Christian. *Equal duties for equal privileges.* St. Paul illustrates this Bible Bill of Rights in his first epistle to the Corinthians, twelfth chapter.\* Read it every word, and learn

\* "Now there are diversities of gifts, but the same Spirit.

"And there are differences of administrations, but the same Lord.

"And there are diversities of operations, but it is the same God which worketh all in all.

"But the manifestation of the Spirit is given to every man to profit withal.

"For to one is given by the Spirit the word of wisdom; to another the word of knowledge by the same Spirit;

"To another faith by the same Spirit; to another the gifts of healing by the same Spirit;

"To another the working of miracles; to another prophecy; to another discerning of spirits; to another divers kinds of tongues; to another the interpretation of tongues:

"But all these worketh that one and the selfsame Spirit, dividing to every man severally as he will.

"For as the body is one, and hath many members, and all the members of that one body, being many, are one body: so also is Christ.

"For by one Spirit are we all baptized into one body, whether we be Jews or Gentiles, whether we be bond or free; and have been all made to drink into one Spirit.

"For the body is not one member, but many.

"If the foot shall say, Because I am not the hand, I am not of the body; is it therefore not of the body?

"And if the ear shall say, Because I am not the eye, I am not of the body; is it therefore not of the body?

"If the whole body were an eye, where were the hearing? If the whole were hearing, where were the smelling?

"But now hath God set the members every one of them in the body, as it hath pleased him.

"And if they were all one member, where were the body?

"But now are they many members, yet but one body.

"And the eye cannot say unto the hand, I have no need of thee; nor again the head to the feet, I have no need of you.

"Nay, much more those members of the body, which seem to be more feeble, are necessary;

"And those members of the body, which we think to be less honorable, upon these we bestow more abundant honor; and our uncomely parts have more abundant comeliness.

"For our comely parts have no need; but God hath tempered the body together, having given more abundant honor to that part which lacked;

"That there should be no schism in the body; but that the members should have the same care one for another.

"And whether one member suffer, all the members suffer with it; or one member be honored, all the members rejoice with it.

"Now, ye are the body of Christ, and members in particular.

"And God hath set some in the church, first apostles, secondarily prophets, thirdly teachers, after that miracles, then gifts of healing, helps, governments, diversities of tongues.

"Are all apostles? are all prophets? are all teachers? are all workers of miracles?

"Have all the gifts of healing? do all speak with tongues? do all interpret?

"But covet earnestly the best gifts: and yet show I unto you a more excellent way"—(which was charity, as Paul explained in the next chapter.)



the justice and the mercy of God in giving us such knowledge of the truth, and such assurance of the love of our Lord Jesus Christ.

The apostle also instructs servants in their rights and duties in a manner that cannot, except willfully, be misunderstood. If they are called of the Lord, their soul service must be given to God; but this does not emancipate them from their secular duties, nor change their earthly condition.

“Let every man abide in the same calling wherein he was called.

“Art thou called being a servant? care not for it; but if thou mayest be made free, use it rather.

“For he that is called in the Lord, being a servant, is the Lord’s freeman; likewise also he that is called, being free, is Christ’s servant.

“Ye are bought with a price; be not ye the servants of men.

“Brethren, let every man, wherein he is called, therein abide with God.”—*1 Corinthians, chap. 7, verse 20—25.*

Thus was settled the Christian polity: no meddling with the question of political or civil freedom, which belongs to human authority to regulate. It is spiritual freedom only that the Gospel brought to light. The Bible guarantees to men *liberty of conscience to worship the true God* as they feel to be right. It does not give to any man, or body of men, church, or bishop, or minister, the right to *compel* unbelievers to embrace the true faith; therefore persecution, even though it were intended to do good for those coerced, is a sin, and *liberty of conscience is the inalienable right of every human being*; because God has willed it.

Any slaveholder who should deprive his servants of this liberty would commit sin. And the Bible lays on the master the duty of giving religious instruction and religious privileges to his servants. To keep holy the Sabbath day, and know his duty to God and his neighbor, are indispensable requirements for human well-being in every station of life.

We come, then, to these three propositions:

Slavery is not a sin:

It does not violate the law of God as revealed in the Scriptures of the Old and New Testament; but conforms to it.

Slavery is not a crime:

It does not violate the Constitution of the United States, the highest law of our republic; but conforms to it.

Slavery is not a wrong:

It does not violate the law of nature, which has assigned to one race of the human family certain gifts of mind and moral endowments superior in degree, power, and usefulness to those of another race; thus creating natural differences and inequali-

ties, inherent in race compared with race, that cannot, by human art or means, be overcome. And that the superior must control and direct the inferior race, in order to bring out and secure the highest good of humanity, is as necessary and just as that the higher faculties of man's nature should control and harmonize his lower appetites and propensities in order to reach his noblest elevation of character and condition, of moral improvement, and material prosperity.

The philosophy of Christianity, drawn from the parable of the talents, and every doctrine of Jesus Christ, teaches *equality of responsibility*, but not equality of condition. Brotherhood and charity—which is *love*—must work out the perfecting of the Christian character. Nor was this perfection to entitle the good man to worldly success, prosperity, ease, health, or freedom.

Was Lazarus, because he was a good man and in want of all things, entitled to demand a share in the riches of Dives? Who does not feel that this beggar at the gate, over whom angels watched, was immeasurably exalted above the rich man, arrayed in purple and fine linen—for whom the devil waited? Yet while Lazarus lived he must remain poor.

Thus the pious slave may, in the sight of God, be immeasurably exalted above his profligate master; yet the former must continue faithfully to do the duties of the condition “wherein he was called.”

The divine Saviour always measures the standard of man's worth by the heavenly inheritance, not by earthly station. Obedience, faith, humility, love, these were the requisites for his followers; nor did their services, however faithfully performed, ever entitle them to demand salvation. That was the free gift of God.

“But which of you, having a servant ploughing or feeding cattle, will say unto him by and by, when he is come from the field, Go and sit down to meat?”

“And will not rather say unto him, Make ready wherewith I may sup, and gird thyself and serve me, till I have eaten and drunken; and afterward thou shalt eat and drink?”

“Doth he thank that servant because he did the things that were commanded him? I trow not.

“So likewise ye, when ye shall have done all those things which are commanded you, say, We are unprofitable servants: we have done that which was our duty to do.”—*St. Luke, chap. 17, verses 7—10.*

Christ does not teach that master and servant are *equal*; but that both are *equally* subject to God. He has the right to appoint the lot of all; He has made men to differ; but His righteousness is clear as the sun at noonday, because all these differences are taken into account when *He settles with His servants.*

Equality of condition is not, then, the law of revelation. Is it the law of nature? Look at the faithful apple-tree. How many blasted buds and abortive blossoms, how much withered, worm-eaten fruit fall from the tree, before, on the topmost bough, perhaps, or, oftener, out from among the thick leaves of one of the lower branches, the full-formed apple appears, in perfect development of beauty and flavor, shining like gold and coral as it crowns its mother tree with the perfection of its kind.

Is it not thus that the history of the human tree symbolizes a race? Take the British oak planted in India. How many strong, brave men, in the bud, blossom, and ripening of their earthly ambition, have been trampled down, crushed out, withered by disease, wasted by disappointment, destroyed and laid in the dust, before the lion banner of Great Britain, waving above the top of India's tallest palm, dominated the land from the ocean to the Himalaya! On that banner *one* name only—HAVELOCK—flashes out with the perfect light of Christian glory, confirming the right of the British people to their eastern empire; because, by the light of Havelock's glory, we read a higher destiny for the dark-skinned tribes of Shem and Ham, through the agency of their white masters.

Christianity, planted in India, is the tree of life whose fruit will equally heal all sin-sick souls that rest beneath its shadow of faith and love, making all who believe *equal* inheritors of the heavenly hope; but it will not, it cannot, *equalize* the earthly conditions of men.

“God shall enlarge Japheth, and he shall dwell in the tents of Shem; and Canaan shall be his servant.”\*

Would the British Government be justified by the Christians of England, or by the voice of humanity, should it throw off the responsibility of ruling that great eastern empire, and leave the poor, miserable, ignorant, degraded heathen natives to their own inventions?

Would American masters, as Christians, deal righteously with humanity, and obey the laws of God, should they throw off the

\* Ethnology, as well as Scripture, testifies that Ham peopled Egypt. The native name Egypt is Chami, the black. The race of Ham includes Egypt and all the black tribes beyond. In the north Caucasian regions the race of Japheth spread widely; and in central Asia the race of Shem. These general positions have been proved by the ethnologists, Pritchard and Bunsen, and are confirmed by the most reliable archæologists, as well as by the leading physiologists of the world, Morton, Cuvier, and Blumenbach.

Dr. Barth, in his “African Discoveries,” states expressly, that he has sufficient evidences that negroes are descendants of Ham. In character they assimilate with the Canaanites of old.

responsibilities of their negro servants, and leave them to their own devices.

*Color* has always been significant of character and condition. The white or light-skinned races are superior to the darker colored. Thus was Japheth distinguished above his brethren; and Jacob, who was fair, was ordained to rule over his red brother, Esau. The race of Jacob are to this day distinguished, from the other descendants of Shem, by the lighter skin, which makes the Jew Japhetic in color. This is a natural distinction; the darker the color the lower is the standard of mind and moral perception, and more degraded the condition. Exceptions may be found; but the rule has always existed, so far as we can learn, in the past. It holds good this day over the whole world.

The abstract philosophy of human rights may denounce these differences of condition as unjust, but where is the remedy? "Can the Ethiopian change his skin?" "Can those who are accustomed to do evil learn (of themselves) to do well?" "If you bray a fool in a mortar among wheat with a pestle," will he become wise?

Men must learn and acknowledge that God's wisdom is above human philosophy; that the finite cannot measure the infinite; that the law of the Creator will regulate created beings in spite of all "declarations of independence," "equality, and inalienable rights" made by men.

This subjection of all mankind to the laws of God is shown to be righteous, because He requires no more of each race or individual than the just use of what He gives. The servant, to whom is entrusted but one talent or five, is never made responsible for the use of ten. The black African and the brown Asiatic, descendants of Shem and Ham, are not required to equal the white European and American descendants of Japheth in knowledge of the true God, or in power of disseminating the truth as it in Jesus, because these talents have never been entrusted to them.

The descendants of Japheth, who have this knowledge and this power, are responsible to God, and must hold the mastery given them for the common good, as leaders and teachers, using their ten talents for the improvement and happiness of their brethren of inferior condition, in equal proportion with their own advancement in civilization and Christianity. Then the Word of God will have power over the hearts of all men, and "the earth shall be full of the knowledge of the Lord as the waters cover the sea."

The axiom of human equality, as urged by those who would place all races and nations of men on a level of natural rights, independent of the will of God, if it could be carried out, would it not beggar the world, and bring down the life of man to his

lowest instincts and appetites? Stagnant waters always become corrupt, and the creatures they nourish are ugly, imperfect, monstrous. Perfect equality in nature would be destructive of all that is beautiful and beneficent in the visible creation. The sea would have no tides; the earth no changes of season; the sky no sun, moon, and planetary systems, "where one star differeth from another star in glory."

So, too, with mankind. If perfect equality of rights and uniformity of conditions could be established, all would be moveless mediocrity or repulsive repetition; an eternal treadmill of custom, where no advancement could be made; an endless turmoil of mind, where the locomotive of thought would be compelled to travel on and on through the dead level of the dark ages forever.

Thanks be to God, who has not left the destiny of men to be settled by theories of philosophical or political abstractionists. God has given us His revealed will to guide our imperfect reason, and we *know* from this inspired Word that the "Most Highest ruleth in the kingdom of men, and giveth it to whomsoever He will."

Jesus Christ declares—"The poor ye shall always have with you, and when ye will ye may do them good."

The apostle says—"We that are strong ought to bear the infirmities of the weak, and not to please ourselves." All power comes from God: the differences of human character and condition are means of discipline and opportunities of duty, which the fallen nature of man requires in its upward struggle after the good.

But are there no points of resemblance in the three divisions of the human family, no stages of equality where the brotherhoods, "made of one blood," rest on common ground in their desires and in their destinies, however much they may differ in complexion, in character, and in condition?

Yes, many, and these of paramount importance, far exceeding the highest earthly interests of which human philosophy takes cognizance, and seeks to equalize.

We might say that all are born and all die, alike helpless and powerless; but the circumstances attending these events are widely different, as all conditions in this world vary in form and consequences.

It is when we come to the relations of man with his Creator that human conditions are equalized. All souls belong to God, and all are immortal. All mankind are sinners before Him, and need a Saviour. All are offered salvation through repentance and faith in the Lord Jesus Christ. All will be raised from the dead at the last day, and stand before the judgment seat of Christ.

All will be judged, "every man according to their works."—*Rev., chap. 20, ver. 13.*

## PART III.

## THE REPUBLICS OF THE WORLD.

History, the glass that reflects the images of the past, shows us, in every land where man has ruled, the form of human slavery.

We will pass by royal governments, so called. These were founded by the enslavement, or, what is the same, subjection of the people to their masters, either kings or nobles, or both. In all these nations, so far as we can learn, a lower class than *subjects* were found, even "servants of servants."

But in republics, those governments where *freedom* was, to a certain extent, enjoyed by *all citizens*, plebeian and patrician, publican and pharisee, was slavery mingled with freedom. Did the "peculiar institution" stand side by side with liberty in ancient Greece, that nursery of heroes, from whom were formed their gods; that mother of artists, poets, philosophers, who were better and more glorious than their gods?

Yes! Athens, the crowned queen of genius, where human intellect attained its highest triumphs of reason, unassisted by divine revelation—the city of Athens was, pre-eminently, the place of slaves. In numbers they far exceeded the free citizens. There was in the city a regular slave market—the *Kuklos*. A household was not considered complete without a slave. Aristotle calls these servants "working tools and possessions." The father of Demosthenes was a large slaveholder, and left these slaves to his son, the orator and friend of liberty. The slaves were of two kinds, those taken in war and those bought with money; and this system was universal throughout Greece. It was universal in all free governments.

History tells us that from the time of Moses to our own Washington, from the Theocratic to the Federal Republic, there has never been the formation of a government for free citizens where bond servants were not included and allowed. Search the records of every republic—Hebrew, Greek, Roman, Carthaginian, Goth, Venetian, Italian, Dutch, American—in all there will be found this class of servile dependents; "persons held to labor;" servants of free citizens; slaves of free masters.

It is worthy of note, also, that none of the nations descended

from Ham have, so far as we can learn, ever formed for themselves a free or republican government,\* (Carthage, in northern Africa, was a Phœnician colony, Japhetic in origin,) or borne the title of *citizen*. All have been ruled despotically as slaves, serfs, or dependents. The same is true of the descendants of Shem, with the single exception of the Hebrew Commonwealth, whose people were made free citizens by laws heaven-given; and yet they rejected this constitution, this citizenship of Israel, and would have "a king to rule over them:"—thus, they became *subjects and Jews*!

The capacity for true liberty requires that man shall govern himself by the best moral instincts of his nature, which, enlightening his reason, enable him to discern his duty towards other men, and do it accordingly. This capacity for freedom and civilization conjoined seems inherent only in the Japhetic peoples, the WHITE RACE.

Does not this indicate, decisively, that the *white race must lead*, if not rule, in the march of human improvement? That if the highest civilization, freedom of conscience, obedience to constitutional law, and the knowledge of the true God—which is the key to all excellence—be ever attained by the dark-colored races of Shem and of Ham, they must be taught, influenced, and guided by the white race?

There is another grand instinct of morality and sentiment of social justice, without which the human becomes brutish, that has always distinguished the white race—it *has been obedient to the Eden law of marriage*. A plurality of wives has never been allowed in Japhetic nations; and *there has never been a republican government that has permitted polygamy*!

This important fact should be carefully studied and earnestly brought out in the controversy now raging in our land. An attempt has been made to identify negro slavery, as legalized under our Constitution, with the polygamy of Brigham Young's colony in Utah, styling these two "the twin relics of barbarism."

\* The Republic of Liberia is not taken into this account. Its rise and progress are remarkable evidences of the beneficial effect which slavery in our southern States has had on the African negroes trained under it. We shall prove this by and by. But Liberia is no exception to the rule that black men have never established for themselves a free republican government, since that was organized by white men. Americans, northern pro-slavery philanthropists, and southern slaveholders—all, in works, Christian—together purchased the domain in Africa, and have ever been the sustaining power, under God, to build up that republic of refuge for the negro, where fanatics, let us hope, will never hinder him from the good he may enjoy and do, because he cannot reach, with one talent, all the duties and dignities that ten talents might be able to attain.

The friends of "the Constitution as it was framed, and the Union as it is," should never, for a moment, permit these false assumptions to go uncontradicted. The tendency of falsehood is always to evil, and in this case it would most assuredly be disastrous and destructive. Slavery is not a relic of barbarism. It has been the means of civilization to ignorant barbarians; the means of enlightenment and salvation to heathen idolaters; the means of freedom and improvement to those nations that worship the true God. It has been the *rule* of all republican governments, and it has been the practice in all the civilized and Christian nations of the world. The learning of Greece, the laws of Rome, the liturgies of the church, the life of commerce, the liberty of the Japhetic peoples, are all based on, and bound up in, that prophetic utterance of Noah, which gave the leadership to the white race. And all events have been developed in accordance with the destiny of his three sons, which he predicted or pronounced.

Through the race of Shem came the knowledge of the true God; the Saviour was in the flesh of this grand race; and the divine revelation was made through its sons. "Salvation is of the Jews." "Blessed be the Lord God of Shem; and Canaan shall be his servant." Truly, Shem was blessed. But the mastership was given to Japheth. It is his now; and his descendants have always led in the improvement of material good and mental power. Since "the Gospel was preached to the Gentiles," they have also led in moral enlightenment and religious truth.

That the Japhetic nations had gained and kept this mastership over other races, by the subjection of the sensual to the moral, in their own nature, is proven by history, sacred as well as secular. They had, intuitively, perceived the right in regard to marriage, that primal rule and fountain of all good in domestic and social life. They saw that no system, save monogamy could be just among men, even if the rights and happiness of woman were thrown out of the account. But as woman is the root of humanity, the right of the child to freedom must rest on the condition of the mother. This, the legislators of Greece and Rome saw by the light of reason, and established their laws in accordance with the truth of nature, which always agrees with the truth of revelation.

This agreement of all free States, heathen as well as worshippers of the true God, in guarding the right of the free woman to her own husband, as sacredly as the right of the free man to his own wife, is a remarkable fact, when we take into consideration the other established fact, *that all these free States were slaveholding.*



We find, then, that republican freedom and domestic servitude have, in history, always been found together; but republican freedom and polygamy never, in any age or nation, have been united. Those persons who assert the contrary, should look over their historical lessons more carefully. Thus we come to the result: the *white race* had, in its natural characteristics, the moral virtues that conserve the well-being and improvement of society, and aid men to the right understanding of the laws of God. St. Paul, in his wonderful epistle to his Roman converts, alludes to these characteristics, when laying down the following propositions:

“For as many as have sinned without law, shall also perish without law; and as many as have sinned in the law, shall be judged by the law.

(For not the hearers of the law *are* just before God, but the doers of the law shall be justified.

For when the Gentiles, which have not the law, do by nature the things contained in the law, these having not the law, are a law unto themselves.

Which shew the work of the law written in their hearts, their conscience also bearing witness, and *their* thoughts the meanwhile accusing, or else excusing one another:)

In the day when God shall judge the secrets of men by Jesus Christ, according to my gospel.”—*Romans*, 2: 12 to 16.

Here we are taught that Gentiles, heathen men, may be “doers of the law” of God, because it has been “written in their hearts;” therefore, without such special revelation as had, on Mount Sinai, been given to the Hebrews, the Roman people might have obeyed God, acceptably, because they could “do by nature the things contained in the law.”

Now, these propositions must have had reference chiefly to the laws of the second table, called moral laws, or, the duties of men to each other; because all knowledge of the true God was utterly lost, and idolatry had, like Egyptian darkness, settled over the nations of the earth. The Romans, when St. Paul thus addressed them, worshipped thirty thousand acknowledged divinities. They could have had no idea, no conception of the “Lord God”—“God alone”—“God, and not man, the holy one.” Nor could they, without a divine revelation, ever have attained to the knowledge of their duty towards God, as laid down in the first table of the decalogue.

But the Greeks, the Romans, and all Japhetic peoples, so far as we know from history, had embodied in their laws and customs the identical enactments, or their equivalents, of the laws of the second table, which Paul thus sums up in this very epistle:

“Render therefore to all their dues; tribute to whom tribute is due; custom to whom custom; fear to whom fear; honor to whom honor.

“Owe no man anything, but to love one another: for he that loveth another hath fulfilled the law.

“For this, Thou shalt not commit adultery, Thou shalt not kill, Thou shalt not steal, Thou shalt not bear false witness, Thou shalt not covet; and if there be any other commandment, it is briefly comprehended in this saying, namely, Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself.

“Love worketh no ill to his neighbor: therefore love is the fulfilling of the law.”—*Romans*, 13: 7—10.

*Obedience to parents* was enforced in Roman law by the death penalty; *murder, adultery, theft, false witness*, were crimes of the deepest obliquity, and severely punished. But SLAVERY—“bondage; the state of entire subjection of one person to the will of another,” (*Webster*;) “*slavery*, the obligation to labor for the benefit of the master without the contract or consent of the servant,” (*Paley*;)—this *slavery*, in its most rigorous form, had been legalized and practiced by the Romans from their first gathering on Mount Palatine till the end of the republic, a period of more than *seven hundred years*. Neither was slavery ever accounted as evil in the republic, or as causing evil to their liberties.

Then onward, during the empire, till its final overthrow, and through the long ages of Gothic rule and papal power, while Christianity was gaining its first converts under St. Paul and St. Peter, and its great triumphs under their successors, St. Augustine, St. Chrysostom, and all the “Fathers”—this institution of bond-service for certain classes of persons, either as slaves or serfs, was the rule in every part of Christian Europe, Asia, and Africa; it was never questioned as a right by any legislator, nor condemned as a sin or a wrong by any ethical or religious writer for more than a thousand years after the Christian era.

True, the expediency (that is, *profitableness*) of holding *white* men in slavery began to be questioned at an earlier period. Captives taken in war were allowed to ransom themselves or be exchanged, and the suppression of Feudalism in Europe, or rather in France, by Louis XI, who virtually freed the serfs from their masters by making all his subjects vassals, and reducing princes and peasants to the condition of slaves—these changes had taken place. But that *negro* slavery was wrong, “damnably wrong”—“the sum of all villanies,” was never thought of. Would the English government have made the treaty of Utrecht, in 1713, and agreed “to furnish the Spanish colonies with 4,000 negroes annually for a term of thirty years,” if this servitude had ever been branded as sin?—“a sin *per se*?”—a sin so revolting that “no slaveholder could be considered a Christian?”

Was this universal sanction of slavery wrong? Was the agreement of the most moral and best civilized nations among heathen,

on this point, a sin? If so, why has not the Word of God specified slaveholding as among the sins of men, so that when the Japhetic race became Christians, they might have broken up the slave marts as they did the shrines and images of idolatry? as they did polygamy among those who had a plurality of wives?

It is certain that the Christian Fathers, the successors of the apostles, the holy men who planted the Christian faith in heathen lands, like St. Augustine among the Britons, held the Bible as sufficient authority on this point. They read the sentence on Canaan, and believed that God had the right to doom a portion of the race of Ham to servitude. They studied the statutes of Moses, and the requirements of the moral law, and found that to hold this race in bondage was made righteous for the Hebrews; and even that, in certain cases, the Hebrew man might become a bond-servant. Therefore, to buy and sell bond-servants was not wrong by the laws of God.

And the Gospel, instead of reversing, sanctioned these laws and usages. Therefore, St. Augustine never urged on the Britons the abolition of slavery, or serfdom, and Britain was one of the great exporters of slaves, sending large numbers of men and women, her own children, to be sold on the continent and in Ireland. "The practice was continued even after the Norman conquest," says a late writer. Nor was it till 1102 that, at a council of the Church, held in London, this canon was adopted: "Let no one for henceforth presume to carry on that wicked traffic by which men in England have hitherto been sold like brute beasts."

This canon was not pointed against the institution of slavery or serfdom at home, but to prevent the foreign traffic in native-born Britons. It (the canon) was never enforced against the British trade in African slaves, which was eagerly entered on during the reign of Queen Elizabeth, and, for nearly three hundred years, prosecuted with great energy and activity, and with the commercial success that British capacity so generally obtains. The British government sanctioned and the nobility and priesthood shared the pecuniary advantages of this trade in Africans. Probably no Christian nation, not even the Portuguese, has trafficked so largely in slaves as Great Britain. This continued till the numbers of black people torn from Africa and sold in the West Indies were computed to be nearly 60,000 annually, when the "orders in Council prohibited the slave trade with conquered colonies." This was in 1805, and the "colonies" those taken in the West Indies from the Dutch and French. It was not till 1811 that the slave-trade with Africa was, by the British Parliament, made punishable as a crime, and then not capital crime.

The slave-trade with Africa had been prohibited by our American Congress in 1808, and was, by American legislation, made *piracy*, punishable with death, in 1820.

There is no European nation, excepting Spain, now openly permitting the slave-trade with Africa; and not a government on the American continent permits it. Cuba, a Spanish island, under British protection, in the American waters, is the only Christian market in the world now open for slave ships. That this foreign traffic in negroes should be suppressed, every sound statesman, every patriotic politician, every denomination of Christians in our land are agreed.

The slavery of the white race in Europe has also ceased, except in the Russian empire, where efforts are now making to effect the emancipation of the serfs. But it is a historical fact, that this freedom of the Japhetic peoples has not been, in a single instance, brought about by Christian effort or Bible authority. No European government has set the slave or serf free because to hold man as the property of man was sin, or so considered. It is the emperor, not the priesthood; expediency, not religion; the ukase, not the Bible, that will free the slaves of Russia.

The personal freedom of the white race—no other race has this freedom—results from the nature of the people. They are worth more to their rulers thus far made free, because they themselves best develop their own energies; they do not need task-masters; their natural faculties and desires prompt them to action, invention, improvement, supremacy. They are the thinkers for and the teachers of the other races. Even as workers, the Japhetic people lead the world. The dark races *must* be their followers, imitators, dependents, servants. God has ordained it.

And now let us come home, and look to our rule and responsibility over the negro race, as its history is connected with our own government.

Is slavery in our free republic right or wrong? a blessing or a curse to mankind?

Whatever it is, one thing is sure: the American people are not responsible for its origin. They never designed it, never desired it, never even consented to it. The system was forced upon them by British authority and power. This should never be forgotten when we deal with the subject.

In 1620 the first negro slaves were brought to Virginia, then settled but thirteen years, a little colony of Great Britain. For *one hundred and fifty years*, or more, British vessels brought their cargoes of slaves; British authority tore these Africans from their homes and forced them on the then British people of America. All the responsibility of the slave trade rests on the Brit-

ish Government; all the gains of the traffic were the exclusive monopoly of British merchants. If there was blame or shame or sin or suffering in those transactions, the curse rests upon the British nation, not upon us Americans, while colonists.

There is a period of twenty years, from 1788 to 1808, when, by American legislation, the slave trade was legalized for our nation, and negroes of Africa were brought in American ships, under the American flag, into our ports, and openly sold into slavery. Those *twenty years* are the sum of our complicity in the slave trade. For that we must answer. Of this, in another place.

And now, let us try to form some estimate of the effect of negro slavery in our land; let us look calmly but searchingly into its depths, and seek to understand its influence, both for good and for evil, on the world.

Its evils on Africa were apparently great, and seemed for a long time without hope or help. Although it is true that the whole negro race were hopeless and abject slaves in their own land, yet, having become accustomed to their fetters, they did not feel the weight. *Idolators, polygamists, ignorant, lazy and brutish*, their minds had lost the knowledge of liberty, truth, and goodness. They embraced evil as their good, and were content. All they wanted was animal enjoyment, or the gratification of evil passions. Their social life was of the lowest type.\*

To tear such a race from their idols of sloth and lust, must have seemed to them the height of cruelty, even had mercy done the deed. Alas! it was no heavenly messenger, but the callous, rapacious, unrelenting grasp of the British mammon of trade. The wars, woes, and wickedness, resulting from the traffic in

\*In a great proportion of these black tribes, their improvement in civilization seems no farther above the brute than the *instinct* of human wants is above the animal. Reason seems never to have been cultivated. There is not a trace of art, science, invention, or concentrated industrial effort, emanating from native negroes, that shows the power of genius and thought to be found in all Africa. Nor have any of the native Africans an idea of duty or moral obligation, except it has been taught them by the superior races.

In religion, all negroes are pagans of the grossest sort, excepting those tribes converted to Mahometanism. All are polygamists, all slaves. Indolence and ignorance, violence and blood, mark the history of all. The ferocious character of the inhabitants of Dahomey, women as well as men, is well authenticated. On the death of the late King Guzo, his son and successor put to death *eight hundred* captives and *two hundred* of the favorite wives of the old King, as sacrifices. Cannibalism is practiced in some, if not many portions of this dark continent, where the powers of evil seem always to have had sway over this black and brutish race. These facts are stated, more or less circumstantially, by every writer on Africa, who has given *his own knowledge and experience among them*.

negroes were dreadful. From the first bargain of the "Honorable London Company trading to Africa," with the black king, who held all his subjects as his slaves, till the slave ship reached Virginia, the amount of outrage, misery, and foul wrong would make a sum of evil only known to the recording angel above. Then, add to this the sum total of all the sins and evils of *the one hundred and fifty years* that British traders in slaves followed up the first successful speculation.

The chiefs that then ruled in western Africa, were always fighting each other, like the Indian tribes of our own land, but with far bloodier hate. Still the slave trade with Europeans greatly augmented these wars. Not, however, to make them more destructive, as it changed the aim from killing enemies to taking captives.

And those who escaped the slave hunts were left desolate indeed. Mourning and woe was the lot of western Africa during the European trade in slaves. All Christian governments, more or less, partook of the spoil; but Protestant England, as has ever been her wont, grasped the lion's share. The traffic was evil; if not all evil, the bad greatly preponderated. *It should be condemned.*

But the holding of these negroes and their descendants, in the servitude to which the British government consigned them in America, is a very different matter.

The slave merchant looked only to his own gains; the American slaveholder, if by nature equally as selfish, was compelled, by the exigencies of the case, to take more thought for the good of his servants. Their hearth must be cared for, and their happiness too, or their master, unless he was a very devil, could not live his own life happily, surrounded with such misery as the English slave captain could endure while crossing the Atlantic.

The Virginia colonist, who purchased negroes, was obliged to support, govern, teach, and care for his slaves during life. The master was also responsible that no harm came to the Christian community from these ignorant, heathen savages.

Hence the laws concerning slaves had their origin, not to oppress the servant, but to protect him, by compelling his white master to be accountable for the good conduct of the black slave.

To improve the morals of these heathen servants the Christian religion must be taught them. Even if masters and mistresses had been themselves careless on this point, they were compelled to the work. The negro must learn the English language, or he could not know his master's will; be taught the knowledge of the true God, or he could not be improved as a responsible human being. And thus the American slaves were instructed and

brought to share in the religious privileges of their masters. The rest of the Sabbath, the attendance at church, the religious teachings and services of the family, are, in our land, as they were ordered to be by the laws of Moses—the privilege of the “men servants, and of the maid servants”—in every household of the South.

There is at this moment more piety of spirit, more faith in God, a deeper reverence for the Bible, among the slaveholders of the South than can be found among the descendants of the pilgrims in New England, where the religious public seems chiefly intent on novelty of doctrine and self-canonization.

Is not this difference attributable, in a great measure, to the ever pressing need of teaching to the slave the elementary truths of the Bible—of the Gospel? This keeps those truths before the Christian families of the South; and the divine doctrine of salvation by the blood of Jesus Christ is the foundation of all real soul improvement.

The women of the South are, as a class, remarkable for their religious steadfastness. Their warm faith finds, in the thoughts and tendance they are obliged to give their servants, directing their labors, watching over their conduct, and relieving their sorrows and sicknesses, a constant incentive to duty and devotion. In truth, we may challenge the world to show such an example of chaste, lovely womanhood, bravely and serenely doing the noblest work of humanity—civilizing and christianizing one of the most degraded races of heathen barbarians—as the white women of the southern States have done for the last two hundred years.

And the black race in America—how has this been employed? What have the slaves done to repay the more than kindness, the real tenderness and love that southern families, in the large majority of cases, bestow on their negroes?

We put by the article of *tobacco*; the world would have been better without it, as it has hitherto been used; and *rice*—that might have been produced elsewhere.

But cotton! the great staple of all manufacturing interests—what should we do or be without cotton? And where, except in the southern States of America, and by slave labor, could it have been cultivated to meet the past wants and the present demands of the world?

Compelled, as we may say, to purchase the poor negro that the government of Great Britain sent from Africa hither, the southern colonist was obliged to find employment for his servants; and behold, the cotton culture has become a POWER to awe even the British Lion!

Let us pause here a moment, and consider what influence this little plant has had already on the destinies of men.

Without cotton, without a supply such as our southern States have afforded for the last eighty years, neither manufactures, commerce, nor international communication could have progressed more rapidly, during this time, than they had done in the previous half century. The influence of the United States on the Old World would have been scarcely felt at all.

To cotton we owe the invention of the "spinning jenny," and all the great manufacturing inventions of Arkwright and others that now fill England with the wealth of the spindle and the loom.

To the increased commerce that cotton has developed, more than any other material agency, we owe, if not the discovery of the steam power, its application to locomotion on sea and land. If cotton had not been abundantly produced in our southern States, as it has not been and could not have been in any other country in the world, neither the cotton gin nor the steam engine would have been known.

And if these had not been known, and had not been urged onward by the continually-increasing supply of cotton, thus keeping up the industrial capacity of all civilized nations to the height that drove commerce almost frantic in the hot haste of business and competition, should we have had that crowning triumph of invention and science, of art and industry—the MAGNETIC TELEGRAPH?

The material prosperity of New England, and the national life of Old England, are suspended on the fate of COTTON. Beware how you trifle with that great interest of civilization!\*

And what of the negroes—the poor black slaves? Have they benefited by their captivity? Have they gained anything while being the instruments of such benefits to the white race? Have their numbers increased? Are they better instructed—

\* "The cotton crop, from 35,000 bales in 1800, valued at \$5,726,000, has risen to 4,500,000 bales, valued at \$225,000,000, and this underlies the industry of 5,000,000 cotton manufacturers in England and western Europe. It is not, however, as a cotton-producing section alone that the South is eminently successful, but it excels in other agricultural productions.

The South produces more food per head than either of the other sections, and its surplus feeds the northern manufacturers. The absurdity of the statements about the northern hay product is made manifest by the simple fact that the South supports 13,475,689 head of cattle, and makes but 1,138,784 tons of hay, while the North is required to make 9,473,603 tons to keep 5,460,820 head. In other words, the expense of cattle at the North is thirty times greater than at the South. The surplus of the South pours northward in an immense stream, vivifying every branch of trade. These products form the basis of all northern traffic."—*Southern Wealth and Northern Profits*, by Thomas P. Kettell.



more improved—raised by Christian hope to a higher type of manhood and womanhood, than their kindred race, the negroes of Africa?

The number of negro slaves brought to the American colonies by British authority was about 75,000. The number brought by American legislation about 20,000. These have now increased to nearly or quite 4,500,000, of which about *four millions are slaves, and one-half million free*, but not citizens of the United States.

The increase of the slaves has fully kept pace with that of their white masters, thus proving that the negroes have, in the main, been well cared for physically. They have been trained to steady industry, to habits of temperance and obedience to law; and to the observance of their Christian duties.

They have been taught the English tongue, imperfectly, it is true; but the foundation is laid, the key is given them to all the treasures of moral wisdom and intellectual improvement that this language of power affords.

They have been taught the saving truths of the Gospel. It is no argument against this assertion to say that the slaves are not taught to read, and cannot read the Bible. How did the apostles teach the Gospel? How was it taught for nearly fifteen hundred years, before there was a printed Bible? and if there had been a Bible, before any of the people could have read it? Even now, more than one-half the people of Christian Europe cannot read, and have no Bibles. How are they taught the Gospel?

And Protestant England—free England, where *no slave treads the soil*, as the boast is—can the people read? Have they Bibles?

Look at the last British census, and the marriage registers: you will find that nearly ten millions of the people cannot read; and if Bibles were given them, would sell these, most probably, for strong drink. Our slaves are not drunkards!

The truth is, that in familiar, oral teaching, when this is done by persons who have a deep individual interest in giving right instruction, and the higher motive of conscientious duty as Christians, the things pertaining to salvation are best made known to the ignorant as well as to the infant mind.

The Lord Jesus Christ himself declares that all men must be as “little children,” if they would learn the Gospel. Heathen, ignorant, degraded heathen, could never learn the Gospel, except it were taught in this humble, patient, simple way of oral instruction. Then, the art of reading and all the resources of education are advantages to be prized, nor are the colored people of America deprived of these. A far greater number of slaves

are taught to read than is generally believed, because abolitionism has distorted or denied all the good that slavery has done for the negro.

The half million of free colored people in America have better advantages of education than any of the working classes of Europe, in the same menial class of life. Two college institutions are now established for colored young men. One is at Oxford, Pennsylvania; the other, the Wilberforce college, at Xenia, Ohio, has already nearly fifty colored students; some twelve of them are emancipated and sent from the South for the purpose, their expenses being paid by their southern friends.

In short, if the four millions of colored people in America, descendants of the ignorant savages brought hither from Africa, could, to-morrow, be gathered together before the assembled world, and a million pounds of gold were offered as the premium to be taken or paid either by us or by the European monarch, who, from the most menial classes of his or her subjects—our free negroes are nearly all servants—could bring four millions of men, women, and children, as well conditioned physically, as well clothed, as free from drunkenness, as well taught in the gospel truths of salvation as our four millions of colored people are;—why, we should take the gold.

Is it not of the highest importance to the black man, and to humanity, that this elementary improvement of character should be made? Remember that these negroes are the descendants of Ham, of Canaan, and that there can be no hope of permanently benefiting the race, except they can be made Christians. That the teachers must have power of some kind over them, is self-evident.

And now we ask, in all soberness of reason, has not slavery in America done these negroes good and not evil? Compare their condition with that of the heathen negroes in Africa, even as British travelers now describe them, and answer.

And yet another boon has been bestowed by American slaveholders on their servants—a boon so great that no people save Americans could have given it—a boon that places the emancipated negro slave, who has toiled on American soil, on equality with the nations of Europe.

We Americans have given these *negro slaves freedom, a country, and a government*. The free republic of Liberia is the legitimate result of negro slavery in the free republic of America. Allow us here to quote from the best American authorities. The facts are too well known to require proof.

“Already there stretches along the western coast of Africa, for 700 miles, \*

republic, recognized by many of the most powerful governments. In agriculture, commerce, arts, and sciences, as well as in morals, she will compare favorably with the early colonial history of this or any other country. And all this has been done by the American Colonization Society.

"About twelve thousand people of color have left our shores for Africa. More than half of them were emancipated for the purpose. In and around the republic of Liberia, native tribes, numbering about two hundred thousand souls, have acknowledged the government, thus opening an inviting field for the civilization and evangelization of native Africans.

"The republic of Liberia has been recognized by Great Britain, France, Prussia, Belgium, and Brazil. During the past year, treaties of amity and commerce have been ratified with the Free Hanseatic Towns of Lubec, Bremen, and Hamburg.

"Two receptacles have been prepared and sent to Liberia for the use of emigrants. They are named 'Tracy' and 'Brewster,' the latter in honor of a liberal citizen of Pennsylvania. The cost was \$12,000.

"An interior settlement has been established, fifty miles from Monrovia, under most favorable circumstances.

"Materials have been shipped from Boston for the erection of the Liberia College edifice. It will cost about twenty thousand dollars.

"A monthly line of steamers leaves London for Liberia and other portions of the coast.

"During the past year a noble ship has been built, for the use of the American Colonization Society, at a cost of about \$42,000, towards which Mr. John Stevens, of Talbot county, Maryland, gave \$36,000.

"Of 130 vessels which have been sent direct to Liberia by the Colonization Society since 1820, all have arrived safe, without having to make any claim on the insurance office for damage.

"The republic of Liberia stands as a beacon light on the shores of Africa. Cheered by God's blessing upon our past efforts, we confidently labor. Our motto shall ever be 'Peace on Earth and good will to men.' May the day speedily come, when the flag of the 'United States of Africa' may float in every port."

\* \* \* \* \*

And here is the opinion of the London Quarterly :

"The achievements of colonization on the west coast of Africa can hardly be exaggerated. There we find a national policy, municipal institutions, Christian churches, and Christian ministers; schools, and a sound system of education : a public press, rising towns and villages, a productive agriculture, and a growing commerce. Under its rule about two hundred and fifty thousand human beings are found living together in harmony, enjoying all the advantages of social and political life, and submitting to all the restraints which government and religious principle demand. Means are found to harmonize the habits and interests of the colonists, their descendants, the native-born Liberians, and the aborigines of the coast. As the creation and achievement of less than forty years, we insist that this is without parallel in the history of the world."

And then compare these results of negro slavery in our southern States with the results of polygamy in Utah.

The first, elevating the African idolatrous slave to freedom, patriotism, and Christianity; the latter, degrading the free white Christian women of Europe and America into slaves, harlots, and idolators.

If slavery be a sin, *per se*, why should the southern system

have developed so much of real good? of Christian progress? of civilized improvement?

If polygamy be not a sin, *per se*, forbidden by God, why should it develop evil, and only evil? Can you show, from Scripture or history, that it ever has done any good? that it ever improved a single human being, morally? or elevated a people, socially and politically?

But, you will say, all the evils of American slavery have not been told—the dissensions between the North and the South; the strife of political parties; the severance of the Christian churches; the bad effects of slavery on the masters, etc.

Many, indeed far the larger portion, of these evils have been caused by other sins, not born of slavery, but of and from the wicked heart of man: envy, selfishness, lust of power, pride, revenge, hypocrisy, and their kindred passions, have moved and led in this warfare. These bold, bad guides have been followed by a multitude of honest minds and benevolent hearts, on both sides of the Atlantic. These ignorant partisans, zealous to do good, are nevertheless working in the dark, or by the deceptive light of a false philanthropy. They have never considered the subject of negro slavery in its broad relations of the best good of humanity; nor have they turned to the HOLY BOOK for guidance in their perplexity. The fierce leaders of abolitionism in America are nearly all of them unbelievers in the Bible, or in divine revelation.

A popular champion in this anti-slavery cause has well said, that “the two great parties now dividing the country were based, the one upon a system of slavery, the other upon an idea, a principle, the recognition of human rights,” etc.

Now, if the system of negro slavery in the United States is based on the law of God, it will most assuredly vindicate its own righteousness, and overcome the false idea of the unbeliever—that “all men are born free and equal.” Christians will be brought to feel and acknowledge that all created beings are amenable to the laws of the Creator, and are entitled to no freedom, no “inalienable rights,” which He has not bestowed; that the differences of outward condition, of natural gifts, are all made even in that righteous revelation of the will of the Most Highest—that *all shall be judged according to the measure they have received.*

The mightiest leader of Japhetic line is no more entitled to demand salvation than the meanest son of Canaan; but the former has, in this life, the right and the duty of mastership, either by example, tutelage, subjection, or bondage, over the sons of Canaan. With the right comes the responsibility of the supe-

rior race to deal righteously with the inferior, laboring earnestly to improve the character and elevate the mind and condition of those whom God has intrusted to Japheth. What nation or people have done so much to improve the character of the negroes and elevate their condition as the slave owners of the United States?

"If American slavery be the horrid system of cruelty, ignorance, and wickedness represented by some writers of fiction and paid defamers of our institutions, how happens it that those who have been reared in its midst, when freed and planted in Africa, at once exhibit such capacity for self-government and self-education, and set such examples of good morals?

Have the negroes under British care at Sierra Leone made similar progress in improvement? Do the free colored subjects of Britain in the West Indies show the capacity, industry, and intelligence manifested by the Liberians, whose training was in the school of American servitude? Nor have the best specimens of this tutelage been sent out. Thousands and tens of thousands of colored servants in the southern States are church members, instructed in their duties by faithful Christian teachers, and the children are trained in the fear and love of God."

The Rev. Dr. Cumming, in his remarkable work, "The Great Tribulation," etc., thus vindicates the right of British conquest and rule in India; in one of these lectures he says:

"You recollect the old prediction in Genesis, that 'Japheth shall dwell in the tents of Shem, and Ham shall be a bondsman of bondsmen.' That was a curse mingled with a blessing pronounced on three races. Now it is not a doubtful question at all what these represent. Shem represents the Asiatic; Japheth the European; and Ham, or Canaan, the African. I do not enter into the proofs. But if you turn to the facts of the case as set before us at this moment, Japheth now dwells in the tents of Shem. England is at this moment the mistress of all India—the most magnificent of the tents of Shem. And it is from this prediction that I believe England will not lose India; for the prediction is that it is to be hers. And again, we read in another passage that Ham is to be a bondsman of bondsmen. Now, what is the existing fact? The African is a slave still. *I am not justifying the people that make him a slave*; but it is the fact in the southern States of America; it is the fact, too, in other districts of the tropical climates; and a fact that we cannot get rid of, and that even all efforts to prevent have only ended in promoting—that the children of Canaan, or of Ham, are bondsmen of bondsmen."

Now, this eminent Scotch divine could vindicate the bloody conquest of India, rejoice that the "tents of Shem" were in England's grasp, and believe she will hold them. Of course he thinks this conquest and occupation right; and yet he is careful not to uphold the "bondage of Canaan" in the United States, although confessing that it has the same Bible authority. Is this Christian charity? Is it doing to his American brethren, the southern slaveholders, as he would expect, as he has the right to expect they will do by his countrymen, that is, interpret the Bible by the same rule for both Anglo-Saxon nations?

If this good Christian minister sees the justice and the mercy

of God in placing India under British control, and feels it right that two hundred millions of native Asiatics should be kept in subjection by British bayonets, because such was the prediction of inspired wisdom; will he affirm that negro slavery in the United States is sin, when this doom of servitude was pronounced on the race now in bondage to us? and both contingencies are in the same sentence of God's Word, and both are to be blessings? Did the all-merciful God decree and legislate for an institution that is "inhuman, pernicious in its character, disastrous to the interests of *free labor*, terrible in its consequences to the bondsman?"

But many iniquities and wrongs grow out of slavery?

Certainly; wrongs, sins, sufferings, and evils grow out of all human institutions, or rather institutions for human beings, because men are themselves wrong and sinful. Yet sin is not in the condition or relation that human beings, by God's appointment, sustain to each other. It is not where men are placed in the social scale, but what they do in their place, that makes the good or evil in the world.

Does the systematic degradation, pollution, and oppression of the female sex in heathen nations result from the dependent condition of woman as wife and mother? Because this condition imposes on her duties different from those of man, and, by the ordering of Providence, leaves her to his care and control, does he have license for injustice and cruelty towards her? Is it not from man's own depraved nature and the temptations of the devil that wickedness springs forth, and not because he has duties devolved upon him towards his family? These duties should make him better, and not worse.

Thus with master and servant, whether hired or bond; their mutual wants and interests should be channels of kindness and gratitude towards each other. If bad passions and selfish propensities destroy the good in this relation, it is not from the condition God appointed, but from human selfishness, waywardness, and folly.

But is the free, hired laborer of Great Britain more sure of life-long support and comfort, of protection and kindly care, than our southern negroes? Are there not millions of poor, toiling slaves in England—*white*, to be sure, but still slaves of that stern master, Want, who grinds heaviest on those least able to bear his hard, crushing millstone of pauperism, in that land of rank and caste, and wealth and learning—and religion? Let us quote British authorities.

In England, as we know, there has never been any legislative provision for national education. The people—that is, the servile class—are doomed to a life of mental darkness, in addition to hard

labor. The fifty-sixth volume of the "Foreign Quarterly and Westminster Review," page 81, has the following plain statement :

"In England, one-half of the people can neither read nor write; and in many of our agricultural districts, studded with churches, the peasantry are as savage, superstitious, and illiterate as those of Campagna or the Basque provinces of Spain."

The descriptions given by Henry Mayhew and Dr. Southwood Smith of the abodes and condition of the "London poor"—that great Babylon, where the wealth of the world is garnered, and "*not a slave treads the soil*"—are to this import, according to Mayhew :

"Thousands on thousands drag out existence—it cannot be called life—in utter destitution, worse even than heathenism; never having heard of the Christian's God; caring nothing for the 'sanctity of marriage,' nor heeding any 'obligations' the Bible, which they never see, and could not read, enjoins."

Dr. Southwood Smith says of the abodes of these poor people—we omit his most shocking details :—

"The result is the same as if twenty or thirty thousand of these people were annually taken out of these wretched dwellings and put to death. I am now speaking of what silently and surely takes place in the metropolis alone, and do not include in this estimate the numbers that perish from these causes in the other great cities and towns and villages of this kingdom. It has been stated that the annual slaughter in England and Wales, from *preventable* causes of typhus fever, which attacks persons in the vigor of life, is double the amount of what was suffered in the allied armies in the battle of Waterloo. This is no exaggerated statement; this great battle against our people is fought and won every year; and yet *few take account of it, because it takes place every year.*"

The "Commissioners' Report on the employment of children in the Iron Trade," etc., gives the following facts :

"Their thin hands, toiling at the vice for fourteen, sixteen, and some more hours of the twenty-four, yet, with all their toil, clothed in rags, shivering with cold, half starved, or fed on offal; beaten, kicked, abused, struck with locks, bars, hammers, or other heavy tools; burnt with showers of sparks from red-hot irons; pulled by the hair and ears till the blood runs down, in vain imploring mercy!"

Lord Ashley, in his speech in Parliament, thus completes the picture of childhood misery among England's poor :

"You engage children from their earliest years in long, painful, and distressing employments. When they have approached to manhood, they have outgrown their employments. They are turned upon the world, without moral or professional education—the business they have learned, pin-making, for instance, avails them nothing—at fourteen or fifteen. To procure an honest livelihood becomes almost impossible. The governors of prisons will tell you, the relieving officers will tell you, that the vicious resort to plunder and prostitution; the rest sink down into hopeless pauperism."

Such are the results of the "free-labor system" in the only

country, England, where "free institutions" are claimed as the rule of government. If it be urged that "reforms" have been effected since the above reports were made, we might cite from British writers hundreds of passages showing the present condition of their poor working classes is that of destitution, degradation, and distress, far below the standard of life-long comfort and security which American slaves are entitled to and actually enjoy. The slave has enough to eat; a home; tendance when sick; a decent burial. The "free laborer" of England cannot, by toiling fifteen hours a day, obtain food enough to satisfy hunger, nor insure a home where he is cared for in sickness, nor have a place of burial, except in a pauper grave. The statistics of London mortality show that in 1858 *one out of every five of deaths* in that great city took place in the hospitals and work-houses.

The London Weekly Dispatch, 1859, in recording the evidence of the oppressions of "free labor" among the stocking weavers, shows that the average rate of wages paid a good weaver, working fifteen hours a day, is about \$1 50 a week, (*twenty-five cents a day*;) and the editor very considerably adds: "How is it possible that families can be supported on such a pittance? What horrible scenes of destitution are hidden in the cellars and garrets of Leicestershire?"

In the Edinburgh Review, April, 1859, it is stated that the "wages of housemaids is *five or six pounds a year*;" on an average, \$25 a year. There are 40,000 of these poor *white slaves* in free Great Britain, nearly all of whom die in the almshouse.

In 1859 the Rev. Mr. Pillington, chaplain to Walsingham, Bridewell, in the county of Norfolk, records that "240 prisoners were committed to the Bridewell, and of these 121 could not read a letter in a book, 157 could not write their names, 57 could not say a word of the Lord's prayer, and 84 could say it but very imperfectly; 61 could not tell who Jesus Christ was, or mention how or for what purpose he died, and were, to all intents and purposes, heathens." He then draws, as well he may, a gloomy picture of "the awful, almost incredible ignorance of the agricultural classes in this district of Norfolk."

We have not called up these images of woe and wickedness, nor sought out these evidences of the evils and miseries of "free labor" in the only "free country" of Europe, to palliate or excuse any of the evils or miseries in our own land. We seek only to illustrate this solemn truth of history and present experience—that where *slavery* is not, by statute or *name*, permitted, and negroes are not found, even there "inevitable circumstances," or "free competition," or abuses of power will bring, aye, have



brought and now keep, a certain class of *white persons*, the poorest, most abject and helpless of the people, in bondage to *MASTERS of their own color and race*; and that "free labor," so called, has modes of subjugation which keep its *servants* in ignorance and inferiority, in want and wretchedness, in servility and sin, far, far more aggravated, absolute, and unrelenting than any of the forms of evil and oppression which negro slavery, in its worst abuses of power, has, as yet, developed in the United States.

This would necessarily be the result, if the Creator and Ruler of all men has appointed, as the Bible declares, the white race to lead or govern, and the black race to subjection and tutelage; then the latter would be benefited and elevated by a state of life which would deteriorate, which does deteriorate, (when compelled,) and degrade the former.

And yet no degradation can beat down the Japhetic soul to a level with the other races. The Anglo-Saxon stock of the white race has this instinct of superior power most perfectly developed of any people, and never more distinctly shown than by Englishmen in India.

Let us take an individual daguerreotype—a real John Bull of the people. He may be one of the most degraded of his type—an ignorant, brutal ruffian; he may have been reared in the dark, dirty dwelling of starvation and sin; seen his drunken father beat and bruise his more drunken mother; and worse, he may have abused and beaten his own good wife, his little helpless children, and finally deserted them all;—which shows a *man of the white race* in his lowest state of animal selfishness, of moral degradation. But there is a lower depth even for him—the lack of knowledge of the true God. This poor soldier has never been taught to read, never instructed in the love of the Saviour; he has grown up heathenlike in the darkness of his soul, never taking the name of Christ on his lips but in derision and blasphemy; he is "living without God and without hope in the world."

But he has been taught obedience to martial law, respect for superior knowledge, reverence for the Bible, and love and loyalty to his queen and country. He is true to the flag. He believes in British right to India. He has faith that his race are to improve, teach, and govern other races, either by the sword or the ship, by the plow or the pen; and this birthright makes him brave in action, strong in labor, enduring in hardship, persevering in purpose. He is ready to obey his rightful leader, to meet the foe, to mount the breach; and though his pay is but a shilling a day, and his name will never be heard of, yet he fights—

and he would fall—with a shout of victory, like a hero. He is an Anglo-Saxon.

Now, place that poor, ignorant soldier face to face with the dark-skinned man of India, no matter of what rank—a Brahmin of the highest caste, of the greatest learning, clothed in the most gorgeous apparel, wearing all the medals of merit and badges of official dignity that can be hung upon him. The white Briton would look down with contempt on the black Brahmin, and count him an inferior.

Is not the soldier right in his conclusions, if not in his feelings? Compare the Anglo-Saxon with the Hindoo. As well compare the lordly lion with the creeping jackal, the war-horse, “his neck clothed with thunder,” and the servile ass, “crouching down between two burdens.”

“God shall enlarge Japheth, and he shall dwell in the tents of Shem; and Canaan shall be his servant.”

What, then, becomes of that much-abused abstraction—“all men are born free and equal?” Let us consider it in the next part.

## PART IV.

## THE DOGMA AND ITS RESULTS.

"WE HOLD THESE TRUTHS TO BE SELF-EVIDENT: THAT ALL MEN ARE CREATED EQUAL; THAT THEY WERE ENDOWED BY THEIR CREATOR WITH CERTAIN INALIENABLE RIGHTS; THAT AMONG THESE ARE LIFE, LIBERTY, AND THE PURSUIT OF HAPPINESS."

This dogma is copied from the Declaration of Independence, framed and hung up in the Old Hall, at Philadelphia, where the Congress of "Seventy-six" held its sessions.

The "Declaration" was written by one of the earnest patriots of that patriotic time, whose loyalty to his country was sincere and self-sacrificing; it was acceded to by the wise and brave "signers" of that potent parchment which boldly threw down the gauntlet before the then most powerful king and government on earth, and, appealing to "the opinions of mankind" for the justice of their cause, with "a firm reliance on Divine Providence," led the people of the British colonies of North America to independence and nationality.

There is no question of the wisdom, the truth, or the justice of the "Declaration of Independence" in all its specifications of facts and deductions of consequences; nor do we controvert its great political importance, nor its mighty agency in the cause of human freedom. It rung the knell of tyranny; it kindled the torch of liberty; it gave hope to the hopeless, and opened the way of progress for the people.

But the beginning of the second paragraph has one sentence, containing thirty-five words, woven into a tissue of philosophical dogmas, that we wish to consider candidly and solemnly, as their importance on the destiny of our own country, the destiny of the world, indeed, is great and solemn.

FIRST DOGMA: "*All men are created (or born) equal.*"

Is this true? Is there a person who ever believed it? ever acted upon it? ever could act upon it? Those men who subscribed to it certainly did not. This dogma has no place in the CONSTITUTION of the United States, adopted twelve years after the "Declaration" was subscribed. The Constitution was framed for "free persons;" the right to hold "other persons" (meaning negroes, and all born slaves) in servitude is fully, fairly, and

unequivocally acknowledged and provided for ; and free citizens are, themselves, placed under conditions that show all men were not considered "equal." For instance, in article 11, clause 5, it is provided—thus : "*No person, except a natural-born citizen, or a citizen of the United States at the time of the adoption of this Constitution, shall be eligible to the office of President, etc.*;" and every article of the Constitution has similar instances of restrictions, qualifications, and conditions on this dogma of equality.

So, also, has the constitution of every State in the Union restrictions and conditions proving that all mankind are not created equal, in the opinion of any legislators who have as yet framed the fundamental institutions of our government.

The women of the Republic, one-half of the people, free citizens, free white citizens, the women of these United States, have never, by any constitution-maker or legislator, been considered "equal" with men ; entitled to the same political rights ; to an *equal* share in the government ; nor has any *sane man*, in any country, age, or nation, ever advocated such measure of equality for the sexes.

In the preceding parts of this work, we have shown that Bible authority has settled this question, giving man—not woman—the right to rule ; that this Bible authority has, far more explicitly and decidedly, given one race of men the right to rule over and hold in subjection another race of men ; also, that historical authority justifies this right through and by the laws and customs of every nation. Every free people, where republican governments have been established, and man has attained his highest development, have held slaves.

*Equality of conditions among men*, therefore, is not necessary to civil freedom and human progress in this life ; nor is it made, by Divine Wisdom, which is the supreme law for all created beings, necessary to moral goodness and the salvation of the soul in the life to come.

The common sense and common faith of the Anglo-Saxon race were like reins of brass and hooks of steel, holding the car of popular sovereignty in our Republic true to its course of civil and religious liberty, in conformity to the charter of Divine Wisdom ; that *ten talents* are worth more than *one talent*, and require more in return ; that the Creator "made men to differ ;" that "there are diversities of gifts, but the same spirit ;" in short, that the rational as well as divine principle of human perfectibility is this : *Unity in diversity ; not equality in uniformity.*

Why, then, was not this dogma of the "Declaration" in har-

mony with these truths? Because the man who wrote that important paper was a philanthropist; not a believer in the Word of God; not a Christian, but a disciple of the French philosophy of the eighteenth century. He wrote and desired to legislate for his order.

The idea that abolishing kings, priests, and prescriptive authorities would remedy the sore evils, abuses, and miseries of society and of the people was deeply cherished and, we doubt not, honestly advocated by the then most acute intellect of Europe; men of the most daring and dazzling genius promulgated the idea; men of the keenest wit and most profound learning were among its earnest expounders.

Man in his primal state was their ideal; man in his natural rights; amenable to none; a law to himself; a king over nature;—these were the dreams of that philosophy which, under the dark eclipse of popish superstition, had never enjoyed the living light of Bible truth, which shows the only way of man to liberty is through obedience to the laws of God, and the only way of happiness is the way of righteousness.

The author of the "Declaration of Independence" had had this Bible source of knowledge around him; its light had not warmed his heart to love religious truth, but it had modified his philosophical opinions. He did not, like Voltaire, hate the Bible; he only disbelieved it. Mr. Jefferson was not an infidel, not an atheist; he acknowledged the Creator, but did not need the Redeemer. Man could not create, but, according to this theory of equal independence, he could sustain himself, and direct his own way.

To be "*equal*" is to be alike in all things; not superior or inferior to another, having the same or a similar age, rank, station, office, talents, strength," etc.; this is the definition of the lexicographers.

Now, were there ever two human beings created, or born, (only *two* persons were created; these certainly were "not alike in all things;" not even the most liberal philosopher would hazard such an assertion,) who were "alike in all things," or *equal*, *exactly equal*, in anything? We need bring no arguments to prove this; common sense and universal experience show diversities, varieties, inequalities, differences among men of the same race, and all more broadly marked among the three great races. Nor would equal modes of training, or equal political rights, or equal privileges of any or of all kinds, ever make men alike or equal.

Take the endowment of physical strength for an example, as this is obvious to all. We put women out of the question on this test, as they seem to have been overlooked in the dogma.

Are men *equal* in physical strength? This quality has always been found absolutely necessary to sustain human rights, which must rest on force or power of some sort. Physical force is that power which, among men, has been and must be evoked when other sorts fail. One obvious sign of this power is size. "Are all men created equal" in size? Some invention more powerful than the bed of Procrustes to establish this equality would be required before the Laplander and the Patagonian would be equal.

SECOND DOGMA: "All men are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights." *Inalienable* means "that which cannot be legally or justly taken away or transferred to another."

Is there any evidence that man has such rights?—rights which cannot be forfeited justly, as the life of a murderer would be?—rights which cannot lawfully be transferred to another, as marriage transfers them?—rights independent of God's will, which He cannot lawfully and justly take away? If man has such rights, or any one of them; if, for instance, he can keep his own life by his own volition, then, in that exercise of his "inalienable right" he is equal with God. Will any sane person attempt to sustain such a dogma by proof?

THIRD DOGMA: "*Men have an inalienable right to life.*"

Where is the evidence of this right or gift, and what is its worth as man possesses it? Can he lengthen his own life beyond the term of God's appointment, or change the day of his doom? Why, then, does the span so vary, from one second of time to a hundred or more years? Would not the majority of men prefer long life?

But, you say, "this is not the meaning of the philosopher; he meant that life should not be unjustly taken away by human authority or custom; that human life should be held sacred." Very good; all this had been settled and secured, by Bible authority, in the charter given to Noah, and in the decalogue written four thousand years before the "Declaration" was penned. The sixth commandment is worth a shipload of philosophical dogmas in preventing murder.

FOURTH DOGMA: "*Man has an inalienable right to liberty.*"

What is the nature of this liberty? and when can he have it? Certainly not when first entering on existence. He is met there by his own utter helplessness, and the soft shield of his mother's love—both more fettering than gaoler or handcuffs. They bind him in swaddling clothes and long clothes; then comes the authority of nurse, doctor, schoolmaster, tutor, professor, all exer-

cising temporary rule over the man-child, whose parents have heaven-delegated authority to control his will and compel his obedience.

Mr. Jefferson did not intend to annul this divine law of parental right, founded on responsibility, to rule over the household, holding the son in subjection while teaching him his duty to God and showing him the right way. Nature also teaches that man should not be wholly responsible for his own acts till he reaches his full physical growth, and is able to support himself. This age the experience and wisdom of Christian men have fixed at twenty-one years. Is he then free? Does he clothe himself in his "inalienable right to liberty," as the young Roman put on the toga, and go forth to do what and as he pleases?

Suppose a young man should believe in this dogma, and commence to act accordingly,—will he find a free field, a wide scope in which to test these theories? Would he not be met at every step of his progress, and controlled, too, by laws and statutes he never voted for; customs he despises, and never helped to form; restrictions on his personal freedom, prohibitions on his desires, vetoes on his cherished plans? Will he not find his wishes thwarted, his hopes dashed with doubts, ay, his right to entertain such hopes questioned or denied by others, "inalienable-right-to-liberty" men, who hold similar dogma patents with his, because *uniformity is the badge of equality*?

Who shall decide between these rivals? No law of God can interfere if man has *an inalienable right* to do as he pleases. Nature, if honestly interpreted, would settle the question; still she is a dumb oracle that, as each worshiper usually understands, has decided in his own favor.

But every sane person knows that he must, when enjoying the benefits and blessings of domestic, social, and civil institutions, submit to a diminution of solitary liberty, of personal freedom.

Then why ever put forth the false dogma of "an inalienable right to liberty?"—a right of which it is even pretended a man cannot divest himself if he would; he may take his own life by suicide, but he cannot sell his personal services for life to another man; this would be slavery. So he must keep his personal liberty, though it should prove a very bottle imp to him, as all fallacies do trouble and torment those who hold them.

Why not say that a man's right to civil liberty, and all other rights, are based on *conditions*; that *rights* always have corresponding *responsibilities*; that the possession of *ten talents* imposes the obligation to use these well, and gain more than would be required of him who possessed *five talents*?

FIFTH DOGMA : There is another inalienable right—"the pursuit of happiness."

Can men catch it? is the real question. What is the worth of our right to run after a rainbow? Is happiness to be caught like the butterfly? or rather, must it not be developed in the disposition, nurtured by wise instruction and patient self-culture, then perfected by faith in the good and resistance against the evil in and around us; as the oak gathers strength by wrestling with the storm, and is then perfected by heaven-sent blessings of dews and sunbeams?

There lives not an Anglo-Saxon man worthy of his lineage who does not place *happiness in character and conduct* rather than in condition and class. There is not a good purpose of the heart, nor a grand hope of the soul, nor a great thought of the mind, but witnesses to these truths of Holy Writ: "Godliness is profitable unto all things;" and "sin is a reproach to any people." Therefore the *doing of duty* makes the man, ay more, makes the hero or the saint, and must make the HAPPINESS of rational, responsible men. There is no other way. If we do our duty we shall have our share of happiness. Duty often lies in low places, but Heaven is nearest us when we most feel the need of God's help.

That men, fallible, mortal, sinful men have "an inalienable right to the pursuit of happiness," is not true, because it would be impossible for all to act upon it without doing evil in the competition. No individual man, nor class of men, nor nation of men, have the unqualified, "inalienable right" to the pursuit of any purpose or object, if such pursuit violates the rights and destroys the happiness of other men. There must, somewhere, be found power to restrain injustice and punish crimes, or the race would perish.

Let us take an example. There is a class of men peculiarly fond of warmth and idleness. To bask in the sunshine through the day, and sleep with heads near the fire through the night; no task, no care, no purpose in life, except sensuous enjoyment; these ideas seem as yet to make up their sum of happiness. Nor is the class small. It numbers, perhaps, one hundred millions of people; they fill a continent—they form a race.

Now, if this race has an "inalienable right to liberty," which neither man nor even God can abridge, and "an inalienable right" to pursue happiness in this way of idleness, it follows, under the *equal rights* system, that all men have a similar privilege of being idle, if they choose. Should they do this, would not the earth become again a waste wilderness, and men heathen savages; and die out, (*like the free negroes in Canada and the*



*northern States*;) except in tropical climates, where nature supplies food, on which human life can be sustained, "cheap as beasts," without care or culture?

Take an individual man: has he an "inalienable right to the pursuit of happiness?" should his notion of it lead him into conduct that would destroy the happiness of his parents? of his wife and children? put in peril the happiness, that is the safety, of his country and his fellow-citizens? Has a *white man* the right to live in idleness when able to work, and throw the burden of maintaining his family on the public? on other laboring men? The world is sustained by hard work, civilized by hard work, and it must be hard work that shall make our portion, our glorious heritage, fit to be called the land of Washington.

"Subdue the world and reign over it," was the command of Jehovah to man.

"If any will not work, neither shall he eat," was the injunction of the apostle to the Christian believer.

"Work—you have strength, reason, feeling; work, and obey the whispers of conscience, if you want the good"—is the voice of nature to those who will hear her.

Man has never been left at liberty to mark out his own way, to pursue his own devices. If he were thus left, his own destruction would inevitably follow. His utter foolishness, wherever he attempts to play the god, is shown in the palpable absurdity of the dogmas we have been considering, none of which have ever been proven nor even practiced, nor can they ever be proven or practiced while "the Lord God omnipotent reigneth."

We come then to the only conclusion that reason, experience, and revelation justifies.

What God has appointed is best for humanity. He has defined the rights and prescribed the duties of each and all men; none save the Creator has the inalienable right to make absolute rules for mankind; and there is no evidence in nature or revelation showing that He ever endowed man with an "inalienable right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness." All these good gifts depend, day by day, on God's will, as the earth depends on the sun for light and warmth.

Therefore, the dogmas we have quoted do not contain "self-evident truths," but specious falsities. Any attempt to prove the first assertion, "that all men are created or born equal," would have shown its shallowness; as it stands without a reason, it seemed deep, as dark waters do, because they have not been fathomed. The other sequences, flowing from this dark, waveless pool, passed unquestioned, all partaking of the same characteristics—unbelief in the God of the Bible; man omnipotent, or sufficient for himself.

Yet strange to say, this infidel philosophy—*liberal* they call it now—had no influence in the organic formation of the general government, nor any place in the hearts or minds of the PEOPLE in whose name the CONSTITUTION was ordained and established.

Thus reads the preamble :

*“ We, the people of the United States, in order to form a more perfect union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquillity, provide for the common defence, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity, do ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States of America.”*

Here “union,” “justice,” “domestic tranquillity,” “common defence,” “general welfare,” are all enumerated, before the “blessings of liberty” are even named ; and then liberty is not claimed as an inalienable right, but “to be secured” as a *blessing*. From what source do blessings come ? From one’s self ? or from the “Most Highest ?”

“The people of the United States” were the men and women who owned the property of the country, and had, by their own efforts and sufferings and the blessing of God, won, in each State, their own independence ; and then, by their own chosen representatives, united in forming the Constitution, as “the people”—thus making a NATION *of white free men and white free women*.

No black person was a citizen of any State. Neither the right nor the justice to hold property in negroes had been questioned, though its expediency had been doubted by Mr. Jefferson and some of his philosophical friends ; but that slavery was a sin, *per se*, had never been even suggested.

There was not then, probably, a man in New England but would have agreed with us that the only way to arrive at the true knowledge of human wisdom, applied to govern men, and its worth, is to compare it with divine wisdom, as revealed to us in the Bible. The decalogue and the special moral statutes of the Old Testament, with the precepts, parables, examples, and doctrines of the New, are the primal source and only sure foundation of equal justice between man and man, and the only true guide for legislators, jurists, and executive authority.

Whenever laws made by men, heathen as well as Christian, approximate to this divine standard of moral law—the nearer the better—they are good and wise. Such laws are found in heathen codes. Greek, Roman, Chinese, Mahometan have each one, made by the light of nature, righteous enactments, agreeing with God’s laws, which have borne good fruit, producing whatever is, or has been, beneficial to the people living under them.

The laws, that is the fundamental *status*, of all Christian governments are, ostensibly, based on the authority of God's Word. Obedience to law is one of the pillars of divine truth, and just judgment is the condition that sustains power.

THE CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES is, however, the most perfectly Biblical of any government ever framed by men. Our republic is based on the moral laws of the Hebrew commonwealth, and, moreover, draws its life and power of living from the Gospel.

*"Do unto others as ye would they should do unto you."\**

This is the only principle of popular rights that can be permanent in justice, and thus sustain republican institutions as the *best* government for rational, responsible men.

*"Render unto Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's."*

This is the only principle of authority that can be consistently and safely acted upon in a republican government like our own, where power is moral, not military; representative, not personal. No man among us is born to official station. No pomp exalts power. No public service nor office claims immunity from public censure. Therefore the people, by their prompt obedience to the Constitution, and the laws in accordance with it, must dignify their government, and, by giving honor to the Chief Magistrate, confer honor on their country and on themselves.

*"Render unto God the things that are God's."*

Here is the secret of our wonderful progress as a nation—the source from whence we must continue to draw our future greatness. All subjects look up to their monarch, as their mentor, protector, and guide. We, free citizens of the United States, who allow no arbitrary distinctions of rank or of office to become settled and hereditary, must have some higher standard of greatness. We must, if we *look up* at all, see the clear light of God's goodness; for no dazzling crown of man's workmanship turns the eye away from heaven. We must worship God! As a people we have worshiped the true God, for the BIBLE HAS BEEN THE PEOPLE'S BOOK.

*"Endeavoring to keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace."*

*"To form a more perfect union"* was the great object of the framers of the Constitution. They did form it, uniting, as it

---

\* If this command of the Saviour is to be interpreted to mean that the master should free his slave because the master would not like to be a slave, then it must equalize all other conditions of life. It must mean *communism*. The rich man must give up his gold; every distinction must be leveled. Does the precept mean this? Answer, ye rich abolitionists.

does, the three elements of power to produce the greatest good to humanity, exactly analogous to the pattern of the same powers or activities in the secular government and union of the Hebrew people.

They, like us, were a free people, a working people. They had, as we have, heathen slave laborers, descendants of Canaan, at the base of their social system; then came free Hebrew laborers and office-holders, belonging to the same class, and chosen by the people, as ours are; then the priesthood, an order of divine appointment, interpreters of the law of God, standing to that chosen race as the Bible stands to us. "The Gospel brought life and immortality to light," teaching all men to believe in the Lord Jesus Christ for salvation, and not in sacrifices made at altars of stone by human hands. Therefore the Bible is now in the place of the High Priest, to make known the law of God.

The CONSTITUTION of the United States, providing, as it does, for the UNION, not only of all the States that formed it, but for all that may ever desire to unite under its conditions, is the most wonderful monument of human wisdom, righteously exerted for human happiness, that the history of man exhibits. It is modelled after the pattern of divine justice, truth, and love drawn from God's works and word, and made practicable in personal rights, State sovereignties, and national authority.

The CONSTITUTION secures to the American people motives and opportunities for every good work. It places before every individual under its sway better means of happiness and improvement than can be found united or attainable under any other form of government. It is the exponent of the plan of the Creator, *unity in diversity, harmony in unity*.

But, as the universe is upheld and controlled by laws that must be obeyed, or the whole course of nature would be broken, and the planets, rushing from their orbits, in the furious onset of unbridled disobedience, be hurled together in fierce conflict and destroyed; so the conditions of our CONSTITUTION must be obeyed, or the Union will be broken up, and whirlwinds of anarchy and fires of evil passions will sweep over and desolate our now beautiful and blessed land.

There is but *one* pretext offered by the rebellious to justify their war on the CONSTITUTION, namely, that it does injustice to the black race by permitting slavery.

We have proven, as every true believer in the Bible must acknowledge, that this condition of the black race is the appointment of the Creator. The only question to solve is this: Does the CONSTITUTION injure the negro?

In the preceding pages we have shown how greatly the slave from Africa—all negroes, except the Liberians, are slaves there—was benefited by being transferred to this country, even under colonial rule; but the CONSTITUTION essentially elevated the condition of the slave by elevating the condition of the master from *subject to free citizen, and giving white masters the right to vote for their colored servants*. If these had ever been considered *property*, in the “chattel” meaning of the term, this clause in the CONSTITUTION lifted them at once to the rank of *persons*, gave them political weight, and brought them into that condition of improvement which free institutions confer on all living under them—as the Gospel brings its light and brotherhood wherever it is taught.\*

But the Gospel did not abolish slavery. Is it to be expected that our CONSTITUTION should prohibit a condition of life which Jesus Christ allowed, aye, justified? He pictures the good master as ordering the “wicked bond-servant to be sold, with his wife and children.” Did not He, who sees the end from the beginning, know that, within eighteen hundred years from the day he put forth that parable, there would be urged an “irrepressible conflict” between belief and unbelief, between good and evil, in which this very question of personal servitude would dominate, and on it be suspended the earthly destiny of millions, aye, hundreds of millions, of human beings? If slavery had been a wrong or a sin, would not Jesus Christ have rebuked it?

We need nothing more. The Bible settles the question. *Free labor and slave labor have been placed, side by side, in the same community, by the authority of the Creator*. Both classes of men were then benefited by this arrangement. Those demagogues who deny this, deny the truth of the Bible, or the wisdom of God. When and wherever the institution of slavery is arranged after the letter and spirit of the Bible, then and there it will

---

\* Slavery in the United States is not of the kind described in Webster's Dictionary as *involuntary*—“a person placed under the absolute command of another, without his own consent.” It may be a true definition of Roman slavery, to say its power was “absolute;” but neither Hebrew bond service nor American negro servitude ever had or ever exercised this absolute power of mastership over the persons owned as slaves.

The religious power, the omnipotent Jehovah, who declares “all souls are mine,” has regulated the service of the bondman. The slave is to have rest on holy days, and instruction in his duties to God and man; and the master is bound to fulfill his own duties to God and man—in which category his own servants are included. Every definition or description of slavery is untrue, so far as regards the institution in the United States; which represents it as unqualified tyranny, or the absolute rule of one person over another person.

benefit both races, the white as well as the black. We must admit this, or give up the Bible as truth, or else charge God with foolishness?\*" The more civilized and better educated the free laborers of a State are, the more the slave population will improve, if the conditions of each class shall be justly, kindly, and strictly maintained.

Two lessons of Bible truth must be prominently set forth in these conflicts of political parties. If we can convince those who have been led astray by the sophistries of infidel, alias *liberal* philosophy, that they are accusing God's law of injustice, of wickedness, when denouncing slavery as sin, then this strife of Christian brethren will cease, and our country will be safe.

The Christians of America can save the Constitution and the Union; therefore, we reiterate these truths, and place them in different lights that the diversity of minds renders necessary. All have not *equal* powers of vision for truth any more than for natural objects. So we will set forth our two additional lessons of truth:

1st. The Japhetic race was appointed *master*, not servant; therefore, no portion of the race can suffer servitude without injury to the whole race. This is the reason or principle that has freed white slaves all the world over, and is now setting free the serfs of Russia. The white man was designed for freedom; as we have before said, *is worth most when free*.

2d. The Hametic race was doomed to inferiority, a portion of this race to bond-service; therefore, the Almighty designed the black man should be improved by a state of life in which the white man would deteriorate.

---

\* "In the free labor system of social organization, the family is the unit—the family, composed of parent and children. In the slaveholding system of organization, the household is the unit—the household being composed of the family and of the slaves, who are united to the head of that family by the obligations of ownership, and the yet gentler ties of constant intercourse and familiar association. In the free States, these families are divided into two classes—the capitalists and the laboring class. The laboring class sells its services for a limited period to the capital class for the means of subsistence. That bargain is hard or easy, in proportion as the supply of labor is greater or less, in proportion to the demand for it, on the part of capital; and in periods of scarcity and of commercial pressure, the bargain on the part of the laborer is often hard indeed—it giving him frequently not enough for comfortable subsistence, and sometimes starving him out altogether." In the southern system of society, no such difficulty can occur. There the laborer is sure of shelter, of raiment, and of food; for, if the profits of the master do not enable him to give him these, the master must use his capital; and if neither his profits nor his capital will allow him to do it, then he must transfer him to some one else, who is able to provide him with these comforts; and thus, in any event, the laborer is assured of the physical comforts and necessities of life."—*Speech of Senator Hunter*.

Let man's philosophy do what it may to hinder, yet God's purpose will stand and be accomplished. One branch of Japheth now dwells in the tents of Shem: the descendants of Canaan are "servants of servants" to another branch of Japheth.

Is this the result of chance? or the ordering of Divine Providence? Is it a "compact with the devil" or the wisdom of God which has placed the negro slaves in the United States?—prospering the work of their hands, blessing them with the light of the Gospel, changing them from wicked idolators to happy worshippers of the true God, from idle, ignorant, barbarians, slaves to barbarians, into useful, respectable servants of Christian masters, whose interest and duty are both imperatively compelling them to "do those things which are just and equal" towards their dependant people?

It is not then *equality*, but *unity in diversity*, that is the principle to be fixed and acted on in our political dogmas, if we would deal justly, and secure the greatest happiness of the greatest number. None, save the Almighty, can make the happiness of all.

To show more clearly the difference between the dogmas of Mr. Jefferson and the principles that guided the men of "seventy-six," and formed the basis of our National as well as State Governments, let us eliminate from the laws and constitutions made by those men a true formula to supply the place of his dogmas.

"WE HOLD THESE TRUTHS TO BE SELF-EVIDENT: THAT ALL MANKIND ARE BORN UNDER CONDITIONS; THAT ALL ARE EQUAL UNDER THE SAME CONDITIONS; THAT THE CREATOR HAS GIVEN TO ALL CERTAIN NATURAL RIGHTS: AMONG WHICH ARE LIFE, LIBERTY OF CONSCIENCE, AND INSTRUCTION THAT SHALL FIT THEM FOR FREEDOM AND THE ENJOYMENT OF HAPPINESS."

FIRST PROPOSITION: *All mankind are created or born under conditions.*

A finite being must, of necessity, be thus created and continued. None save the INFINITE can be unconditioned.

SECOND: *All mankind are equal under the same conditions.*

The woman was created for the man, to form together, in the union of marriage, one complete humanity. No differences of rights were predicated between the sexes by the Creator; but, after the fall, the subjection of the wife to her husband was promulgated. Thus was established *unity in diversity and harmony in unity* as the law of this humanity, which represented all mankind.

The man, under his condition, has the right to love, reverence, and obedience from his wife; the wife, under her condition, has the right to love, honor, and protection from her husband. All

husbands have equal rights; all wives have EQUAL rights. It is their condition of marriage. Will any Christian legislator controvert these axioms, or desire to have them subverted? Would it be more conducive to human happiness and the real improvement of mankind if man and woman were placed *equal* in all rights? We say, no! What God has ordained is best for humanity.

*The child*, under its condition, has the right to love, nurture, instruction. All children have, by the law of nature, which is the voice of God, this *equal* right. But have children the right to fix the condition and manner of their life? Or have legislators authority to decree that all children shall be treated and trained exactly alike? made *equal* in all things? None save a godless socialist ever entertained such an impossible plan, such a destructive idea.

*Master and servant (or slave)* are conditions of two classes of men; conditions imposed by the Most Highest as surely as the conditions of marriage and of the household are fixed by His authority.

The condition of the master is to give employment, support, and protection to his servant, to rule over him in justice and mercy, and teach him knowledge that is good for him.\* The condition of the servant is obedience, service, and faithfulness. The servant has the *equal* right to claim fulfillment of duties from his master that the master has to claim duties of his servant, whether bond or free. Unity in benefiting each other; diversity in the manner and the opportunities; these are the conditions of improvement for both classes. Both are responsible to God.

This second proposition is very important:—"All men are equal under the same conditions." From this was drawn the principle that justified the revolt of "the British colonies in North America," and gave them the right to "independence." The American colonists were born British subjects, entitled to all the rights and immunities of this condition, liable to no other duties or impositions. To these the colonists willingly submitted.

The false dogmas that all "*men are born equal*," and have "*an inalienable right to liberty*," had never been dreamed of, except by infidel philosophers, never put forth by any patriot or statesman, or people; nor did the colonists of America believe in them. Every British subject then, as now, bowed to the supremacy of Parliament and the majesty of law; but the House of Commons only could levy taxes on the people, and the people

---

\* The servant has always the right to liberty of conscience, and the master who does not teach or cause others to teach his servants their duties to God as the Bible sets these forth, is foolish as well as sinful. The Bible is the Book for all.



had the right to be represented in the House of Commons. This was the *condition*, violated towards his subjects in North America, which put George III. in the category of a tyrant when he sanctioned the tax of three pence per pound on tea; and it was the violation of this condition that sustained the right of rebellion for the revolted colonies and the Declaration of Independence.

Read over that important document, and search if you can find any grievances set forth, or causes for the separation of the colonies urged, which have reference to that portion of the preamble, (we have styled dogmas,) enunciated as "*self-evident*." You will search in vain.

These dogmas, then, did not aid the cause of the colonies in their struggle for independence; nor did they aid in framing our national Government. We have shown that not one of these was incorporated in the Constitution. The false cannot aid the true; whatever effect it has is to weaken the right and mar the good.

It was so with these dogmas. They blinded their author, clear-minded as he was, patriot as he was, truly as he loved his country and loved liberty, he was so blinded by their sophistry, that he stumbled over without heeding the great foundation rock or principle of civil liberty which, fully enjoyed under divine sanction, effectually secures equal justice and progressive improvement to all mankind. This God-given principle is "*liberty of conscience*."

So completely was the idea of this principle lost sight of by Mr. Jefferson, that in his "Declaration" not a trace appears; nor was it recognized in the Constitution as submitted to the people; but when their voice was heard demanding this right, then it was added as an after thought, and what should have been the head became tail.

Secure this right—"liberty of conscience"—to a people; then secure the right of "instruction that shall fit them for freedom and the enjoyment of happiness." Place the Bible in their hands, and they will work out their own best improvement, according to condition and character.

We include in this liberty of conscience the knowledge of the true God, as the Bible discloses it. No other system of religion gives this liberty; no other system harmonizes with republican freedom. We must have the Bible, or we cannot understand the nature and limits of this liberty, any more than a blind man can comprehend what is light.

Give this liberty of conscience to the people of Europe, and how long would the Pope dominate in Rome, or Austria's despotism be endured, or other forms of absolutism have rule? Give

these same weapons of divine power to the intelligent Japanese, how long would their "government continue a complete tyranny?" Everywhere the good fruits of these principles would be manifest in good for humanity.

Not so with the dogmas of Mr. Jefferson. They stood on our "Bill of Rights" like the circle of Stonehenge, that nobody knows what to do with; the stones support nothing, but they are massive, and have been a temple of worship. The dogmas gave no support to any known truth; but they enunciated strength in man. Their vagueness, moreover, gave scope to imagination on which to build a magnificent temple of worship to the GODDESS OF REASON. Man must worship somewhere.

They did build such a temple. Not in our land; we had the open Bible; the true God was worshipped here. But France, revolutionary France, where the ideas originated, accepted the dogmas with a yell of delight, a shout of triumph, that made Europe tremble, and every king in Christendom put his hand on his crown.

As the eye, gazing for a long time intently on scarlet, takes that hue into the sight, as it were, until every object looked upon becomes red, so the minds of a certain class of persons, by dwelling on these undefined dogmas, became so imbued with the vague ideas of "*Liberty, Equality, Fraternity*," that they could see no hope for man, no justice for the people, but in the destructiveness that should sweep all obstacles, all tyrants—meaning those who did not accept these ideas—from the earth.

Marat, Robespierre, Danton, the terrible Jacobins, and the ferocious *sansculottes* and *poissonnieres*, were the natural outgrowth of the unbridled passions of men, set free from responsibility to God, each individual having "*equal and inalienable right to liberty*," and every other good thing he could get in the mad "*pursuit of happiness*." History tells the result.

We shall not attempt to describe the terrible tyranny, the monstrous massacres, of those French apostles of Mr. Jefferson's great ideas, when they tested the worth of his dogmas of *equality and liberty* by the persuasive arguments of bludgeon, pike, and guillotine, till the stones of the streets were softened in the blood of the best and noblest men and women of France, and Paris became the city of death. Then was gained the legitimate triumph of the dogmas—the open acknowledgment of unbelief in the Bible, the establishment of the reign of terror, and the worship of the goddess of reason.

Following this terrible experiment, and incited by the same dogmas, came the horrible insurrection of the slaves in St. Domingo, when, under the leadership and counsel of that "black

hero," Toussaint, the negroes butchered, indiscriminately, all *white men, women, and children, good masters*, as eagerly as those who had been cruel, using poison, fire, sword, till the devils of the lowest hell seemed holding carnival in that beautiful island!

Here we may reasonably ask the fierce inciters to such insurrections—if *all men have an alienable right to life* as well as to *liberty*, and both are *equally* secured—why has the slave any warrant from these dogmas to take away *life* in pursuit of *liberty*? But, as the worshippers of the "goddess" rarely trouble themselves about such Bible nonsense as "conscience," or such metaphysical quibble as consistency, they would probably suggest that the murders and rapine were committed in the "inalienable pursuit of happiness."

The terrors of the French revolution, its concomitants, and its results, effectually sobered the minds of the leaders of unbelief in our own land. Mr. Jefferson, whatever may have been his religious opinions, nevermore put forth theories; and all experiments for testing in our republic the equality of races were, and are, *with the party that sustained his administration, and now support "the Constitution as it was made, and the Union as it is," utterly repudiated and given up!*

In Europe the reign of terror, that is, of atheism and anarchy, led to such disgust of the terms "liberty," "equality," "republic"—that the empire, with the most stringent absolutism, is now blessed and sustained, not only by the conservative classes in France, but the masses—the people are nearly unanimous in its favor.\*

---

\* We have the testimony of one of the autocrats of American progressive liberalism on this subject. Rev. Theodore Parker thus writes from Rome:

"I dislike much that Napoleon has done, but must confess an honest admiration for his efforts to liberate Italy, and to advance the industrial interests of France. After all, it is probably true that his nation deserves no better rule than he gives it, and is not capable of more liberal institutions. Those Celtic people have got equality; the old aristocratic regime is perished utterly; all depends on universal suffrage; liberty is something they care little about. A strange people are the French—with so much military courage and no civil courage at all. I don't see how they could live under a republican government—one like ours, I am sure, would be impossible."

Here are some curious opinions. EQUALITY is defined as "*universal suffrage*." The right to deposit a vote under the surveillance of military police in pay of the Government, is—"equality." The French people have got it! Then "the Celtic people are not capable of liberal institutions;"—"they could not live under a republican government like ours." Yet this same gentleman, a profound scholar, a man of distinguished ability, argues that the negro slaves in our land are fit for liberty, capable of becoming American citizens, *equals* with Anglo-Saxons! Truly the Celtic people must be in a miserable condition if they are thus inferior to the negroes. And what becomes of the dogma—"all men are born equal"—if the Celt is so inferior to the negro?

Still the dogmas stood on our Declaration of Independence, and our republic was successful. We had contributed the creed for the worship of the goddess of reason, and although her temple in Paris had been overthrown, crushed, and was held in abhorrence, yet the idea of an unqualified right to liberty had left its impress on many ardent minds, especially among the young men of Germany and Great Britain.

These could not fail of seeing the glaring inconsistency of the creed of man's unconditioned equality and inalienable right to freedom, which Americans professed to hold, and their practice of retaining in bondage millions of the black race. And although the African slave trade had been relinquished, and in 1808 was sternly prohibited by the American Government, with the death penalty as punishment, yet the inter-State traffic "in persons held to service" was carried on, openly and lawfully sanctioned by the Constitution.

The horrible cruelties practiced on board British slave ships had, towards the close of the last century, awakened serious sorrow in the minds of Christians in that country, and earnest men were seeking to find the right way of abolishing that evil traffic. The efforts of one man had the most marked effect, and deserves particular attention.

Thomas Clarkson, a young Englishman, was a student at St. John's College, Cambridge, 1784, when the subject given for the prize essay was—

*"Is it right to make slaves against their will?"*

He took the negative side, which he sustained by the theory of the natural laws that all men are born equal, and have an inalienable right to liberty, etc., and so triumphantly, that he won the prize, was applauded greatly, and became, from that time to his death, the ardent champion of abolitionism of the slave trade, and then of negro slavery in every form.

That he was a sincere philanthropist in his heart there can be no doubt. He deserves high honor for his efforts in suppressing the slave trade. The question is—was he right in denouncing *slavery itself*—the bond-service of the black race, in the West Indies and the United States, as unrighteous and sinful?

What God has established shall man condemn as sin? The Bible and Thomas Clarkson are in conflict. Which is right?

We have proved, in the preceding pages, that the Bible sanctions slavery; that Japheth was to rule, and Canaan to serve; that the white race was appointed master, and the black race subordinate; that the Creator settled these conditions of the sons of Noah, and that the fiat of human law cannot alter them.

We have shown that the Bible fully and fairly meets these questions, providing, by its laws, usages, precepts, examples, injunctions, and doctrines, both of the New as well as the Old Testament, for the conditions of servant and master, as surely as it provides for the conditions of husband and wife, parents and children.

There is no way of escaping these conclusions, except by boldly denying, as unbelievers do, the Bible to be the Word of God, or denying the authority of God as the Bible reveals Him. The last mode is that usually practiced in Christian countries by persons who are not real Christians. These do not reject, ostensibly, the Bible, but they put their own reason above its authority, and prefer their own dark lantern of natural conscience to the solar light of the Gospel of Jesus Christ.

Such a philanthropist was Thomas Clarkson. He belonged to the Society of Quakers or Friends. Are these Christians? The Saviour says, "Follow me;" "Do this in remembrance of me;" "Ye are my friends if ye do whatsoever I command you." The Saviour left ordinances to be obeyed. He instituted a Church to be continued after His example and precepts.

Is yonder gathering of people a church after Christ's example and ordinances? The men keep silence and the women speak; the voice of humble, contrite prayer is never heard; the song of praise and thanksgiving, the strains of sorrow and penitence, never awaken the careless to the thought of God, or kindle joy in the believing soul. The baptism by water, which was to mark the disciples of Jesus Christ, as followers of His example and be the emblems of regeneration by the Holy Ghost, is utterly rejected. The holy sacrament of the bread and wine, symbols of the body and blood of our crucified Lord, given for the sins of the world—this sacred ordinance that He exemplified as His last and loving ordinance for His disciples, is put aside as unnecessary.

Are they Christians who do this? The Quakers do not claim the title, nor have they any right to it while rejecting baptism and the Lord's Supper. They are *Friends*—nothing more. "FRIENDS"—which means that they take excellent care of themselves and of their own people in all material things, and have, as they believe, the "inward light" to discern spiritual truth sufficient for themselves and their order.

That they are not Christians, had not, and have not the true faith and true life in Jesus Christ, is proven by this: they have only been sustained by outward pressure, as it were, such as peculiar modes of speech and dress, compelled by their rules; or by persecutions from other denominations; or some extraneous effort of benevolent philanthropy, like this anti-slavery excite-

ment. Whenever these modes of effort and excitement fail or decrease their numbers decrease.\* There is no living element in their religion. The sect is literally dying out; starving for lack of the true bread of life; withering away because the living waters of divine truth are not contained in their broken cisterns, and have never been permitted to flow into and refresh their barren souls.

Rejecting the Bible as the rule of faith, they set up the "inward light"† as their idol, and this assumption would naturally and inevitably lead them to embrace the dogmas of Mr. Jefferson, because these were in harmony with their own belief, and materially strengthened their own position. The Quakers would obey no law except it harmonized with "inward convictions." This was "personal liberty" in its spiritual form; not merely liberty of conscience to worship God as they thought right, but liberty to refuse the usual modes of respect to magistrates and obedience to civil ordinances when these did not agree with their peculiar "inward impressions" of duty.

It is, therefore, no wonder that the order of Friends or Quakers in England and America eagerly followed the lead of Thomas Clarkson, and became abolitionists. They wanted an active principle or object of duty. The negro slave was, accordingly, placed as the central light (or darkness) of their philanthropical ideas, and emancipation became their gospel of salvation for the world.

Thus, the Goddess of Reason was set up in England to be worshiped as the Supreme Good, none the less blindly or idolatrously than in Paris, because she now was clothed decently, and had gifted men and pious women kneeling before her shrine.

The Christians of Great Britain followed, slowly, but they followed the example of the Quakers, and subscribed to their creed of worship.

First came the Presbyterians, disciples of Calvin and Knox, believers in the covenants of the Old Testament, which distin-

\* There are not now (1860) in Great Britain and Ireland more than 26,000 professing Friends. In 1690 there were sixty or seventy thousand, more than double the present number. Quakerism has nearly disappeared from the continent. It is fast diminishing in the United States.—See *Quakerism, Past and Present*; by J. S. Browntree. London: Smith & Elder, 1859.

† Fox complained that "the faith of the sects stands on a man who died sixteen hundred years ago;" and wanting "a deliverer for that year, for that hour, a light for every moment." This deliverer, this light, was in man himself; neither conditioned by time, place, creed, occupation, character, age, or sex; and opposed only by sin and self-willed darkness. What was this doctrine, if it did not set up man as his own saviour, a god, who had not only an inalienable right to personal freedom, but also to personal righteousness, if he so willed?

guishes some men above other men; taking the covenant made with Abraham as the seal of faith for their little ones, and holy Noah and the patriarchs, with Moses, Joshua, Job—all slaveholders and teachers of the laws of God, appointing bondage as the lot of the race of Canaan,—the Presbyterians, exalting the doctrines of Paul, because of their sound reason and boldness in truth, though he declared over and over, again and again, the righteousness of that obedience which bond-servants owe their own masters,—the Presbyterians bowed low before the goddess of Quaker worship, and confessed that “*all men are born equal, and slavery is sin!*”

The Baptists, warm-souled, self-sacrificing Christians as they are, so loving the Saviour that they follow His footsteps into the waters of baptism, believing they rise with Him in newness of soul life—the Baptists, who should have felt that they were dishonoring their Divine Master, as He, in His Gospel, clearly sets forth that to hold slaves and sell a wicked servant “with his wife and children” is perfectly compatible with Christian duty—the Baptists knelt down before the goddess of Quaker worship, and cried, “*all men are equal, and slavery is sin!*”

The Methodists, those earnest, cross-bearing Christians, who hold pious Wesley and fervent Whitefield as patterns of pious excellence, and these admitted slaveholders into their churches, not without scruple certainly, but because constrained by the text—as no word in the Bible could be found condemning, but very many ordinances and examples sustaining the institution by order of the Most Highest\*—the Methodists, though they imitate the unquenchable ardor of Peter, and, as he enjoined, “have purified their souls in obeying the truth through the Spirit unto unfeigned love of the brethren;” yet forgetting that the same apostle has left this command, “Servants, be subject to your masters with all fear, not only to the good and gentle, but also to the froward”—the good Methodists fell prostrate before the goddess of Quaker worship, shouting, “*all men are equal, and slavery is sin!*”

\* The following copy of the instructions given by the Wesleyan connection of England to their missionaries in Jamaica shows the opinions of Mr. Wesley on this subject:

“As in the colonies in which you are called to labor, a great proportion of the inhabitants are in a state of slavery, the committee must strongly call to your recollection what was so fully stated to you when you were accepted as missionaries to the West Indies, viz: that your only business is to promote the moral and religious improvement of the slaves to whom you may have access, without in the least degree, in public or private, interfering with their civil condition.”

The Episcopalians of the English national church, whose foundation is claimed to be on the prophets and apostles, Jesus Christ being the chief corner-stone—the Episcopalians, holding “apostolic succession,” and tracing back the founder of their church to the sainted Augustine, who, more than twelve hundred years ago, as archbishop of Canterbury, was primate of all England, and had always been in the midst of slavery without ever rebuking it as sin; nor had his successors, learned and pious men, holding that high seat, (*till the present incumbent*,) ever hinted that slaveholders should be considered as guilty of sin: how could they? when the two most eminent apostles had enjoined the duties of masters and bond-servants on their converts, and urged such teachings on the bishops they ordained, thus sanctioning the Gospel right to masters as well as servants;—the Episcopalians, who listen every holy day to the commandments, two of which particularly sanction slavery; yet they yielded—reluctantly, we hope—but they yielded to “the delusions of the devil,” and joined the throng of British abolitionists around the altar of the goddess of Quaker worship, acknowledging that “*all men are born equal, and slavery is sin!*”

And so the tide of fanatical falsehood rose higher and stronger till it beat down Bible truth and human experience, common sense and equal justice, and swept over the public mind, compelling the British government to do that act of foolishness, injustice, and wickedness, setting free the colored slaves of the West Indies, who were not able to sustain themselves without direction, but would sink down into listless idleness, and fall back into savagery and heathenism, *unless continually sustained and fostered by special legislation*. This has been awarded them, while the poor white population of England, born British subjects, free, Christian fellow-subjects, were and are kept in heathen ignorance, in worse than West India bondage, subjected to the most grinding toil, uncared for and unrelieved under the most abject poverty.

Let us take a few specifications and illustrations.

The British government paid to the British owners of *black* slaves *one hundred millions of dollars*.

This large amount was drawn from the *white* people of Great Britain, the poor, hard-working classes being taxed for the greater proportion of this immense sum.

To the honor of that people be it recorded here, that not a partisan of emancipation ever dreamed of “throttling slavery” by stealing the slaves, exciting insurrections, or murdering the masters. The British abolitionists were willing to be taxed for money to buy the freedom of the slaves. These abolitionists



were sincere men and women; but were they not mistaken in their manner of doing good to the descendants of Ham or Canaan?

Let us look at the results.

The British possessions in the West Indies, financially, industrially, and morally, were, for both races, irreparably injured by emancipation. We have the strongest testimony, that of anti-slavery British writers, to these melancholy facts of the decay of Christianity and the ruin of civilization, by the ruin of industry and the withdrawal of all the Europeans who could possibly get away from the islands when the blacks were made free. No white families remained in Jamaica because they choose to live among black people, as equal fellow-subjects. The negroes gained no friends by emancipation, but enemies and oppressors. They were and are more to be pitied than when they had masters, because they *need masters*, as surely as white men, when residing in tropical climates, *need servants*. *The master is the natural protector of his own slave.*

The negroes in the West Indies, indolent, dependent, and imitative, needing a model, a support, a director, in the great effort and change of rising from barbarism to civilized life, were thrown, by emancipation, on themselves. The downward tendency of the great majority has been rapid and inevitable. They are lazy, and will not work. That once beautiful island has become a desolation. To prevent utter ruin, laborers must be brought from India and China. Thus the abolition of negro slavery has led to the Cooley apprentice system, more iniquitous and horrible in its injustice and cruelty than ever the African slave trade was, even in its worst aspects.

Here we have three results, all evil, already developed by British abolitionism.

1. The Cooley trade and its wickedness.
2. The injustice of taxing the poor white toiling millions of Great Britain to free the black slaves of the West Indies, and then permitting those emancipated negroes to live in idleness, exempt from all care and all State taxation, while still the poor ignorant white population of Great Britain has to bear heavier burdens of taxation because the West Indies are impoverished and ruined.
3. The foolishness of lavishing *a hundred millions of dollars* (twenty millions of pounds sterling) in the vain attempt to make less than a million of black slaves equal with white British subjects, while refusing a dollar to found national schools for the benefit of ten millions or more of their free, native-born, white population, who are perishing for the lack of knowledge—is not this an evil?

We might fill pages with British testimonies of the miseries, ignorance, and degradation of the hard-working population, the free, white peasantry of their own race, for whom no means of instruction have been provided, no opportunities of bettering their condition allowed, no sympathy for their sufferings manifested.

The author of "Alton Locke" thus sums up the condition of the poorest classes of England :

"Savages, without the resources of a savage; slaves, without the protection of a master; to whom the cart-whip and the rice swamp would be a change for the better—for there, at least, are food and shelter."

Mr. Roebuck lately said, in his place in Parliament, (the question was the barbarous treatment of children in the English factories :)

"I have it in this book *that children's hands are often blistered, and the skin torn off their feet, and yet they are thus obliged to work—the persons who overlook them being sometimes forced to keep them awake by beating on the table with large boards.*"

The last words of Mr. Justice Talfourd were—

"That the great cause of crime and prostitution in England, was the want of sympathy by the rich for the poor."

And yet it is claimed that Christian benevolence freed the slaves in the West Indies! Is this true, when the results of that fanatical generosity to the poor black servants has superseded Christian justice even to the poor white servants? and both classes and all parties have suffered injury by this departure from that irrevocable sentence of the all-wise and righteous Creator: "God shall enlarge Japheth, and he shall dwell in the tents of Shem; and Canaan shall be his servant?"

Now, no Christian will deny that obedience to God's law is the duty of man. God's law is the life of the universe. Apart from His law, existence is a contradiction, and only in perfect submission to the will of God is the freedom of man attainable, because God only is free. The devil can go further than the length of his chain. How can he give freedom to his slave when he is under sentence of condemnation? All his promises of equality and freedom are false, and bring evil and only evil.

The Creator never gave man absolute freedom. *It was freedom to do right* that was given. While acting in conformity with the laws of God, natural and revealed, man is free to choose his own way, and work in whatever manner best suits his particular desires. Cain might have kept sheep, had he chosen; but he was not free to kill his brother when he chose. Every good

work is acceptable; every evil work is punished. This is the freedom that God has given to mankind.

And these principles of eternal justice furnish the rules of common justice that govern in human life. The good father gives his children liberty to do well; their evil deeds are never sanctioned. All penal laws are founded on this truth: that men have no liberty to commit evil deeds. If they do, they are to be punished. Thus Ham was punished for sin, and the law of slavery for that race is a righteous sentence, or the Word of God is not true.

Hence we see why the emancipation of the West India negroes, in opposition to the law of God, has worked evil for the servant as well as for the master, and evil for the country also. While the white English laborer is compelled to work from 10 to 18 hours per day for a mere pittance that scarcely supports life, and young children toil till their soft bones are crippled by the hard work, and old age is bowed down in misery, and dies in the poorhouse, the negroes, under British rule, may lie in the sun, and are free to waste and destroy one of the fairest and richest colonies of the world; yet this wicked license is sinking them into savagery as surely as it destroys the civilization of Jamaica.\*

\* "As far as Jamaica is concerned, what is there to tempt the Englishman? It is a fact that half the sugar estates, and more than half the coffee plantations have gone back into a state of bush, and a great portion of those who are now growing canes in Jamaica are persons who have lately bought the estates 'for the value of the copper in the sugar boilers and of the metal in the rum stills.'"

\* \* \* \* \*  
 "Floods of pathetic eloquence and long years of parliamentary struggling have taught us to imagine that the world was made for Sambo, and that the sole use of sugar is to sweeten Sambo's existence. The negro is, no doubt, a very amusing and a very amiable fellow, and we ought to wish him well; but he is also a lazy animal, without any foresight, and therefore requiring to be led and compelled. We must not judge him by ourselves. That he is capable of improvement everybody admits, but, in the meantime, he is decidedly inferior—he is but little raised above a mere animal. The negroes know this themselves. They have no idea of country, and no pride of race. They despise themselves. They know nothing of Africa, except that it is a term of reproach, and the name which offends them most is that of a nigger. So little confidence have they in any being who has an admixture of their blood that no negro will serve a mulatto when he can serve a European or a white creole.

\* \* \* \* \*  
 "A servile race, peculiarly fitted by nature for the hardest physical work in a burning climate, the negro has no desire for property strong enough to induce him to labor with sustained power. He lives from hand to mouth. In order that he may have his dinner, and some small finery, he will work a little, but after that he is content to lie in the sun. Thus in Jamaica he can very easily do, for emancipation and free trade have combined to throw enormous tracts of land out of cultivation, and on these the negro squats, getting all that he wants with very little trouble, and sinking in the most resolute fashion back to the savage state."—*London Times*, January 6, 1850.

There can be no Christianity where there is no industry, because God has ordained that man shall work.

Now, is there not a great mistake in the reasoning of any philanthropist when his plans injure all whom they influence? In this case the falsity was in the application of the prize essay to African slavery, as though *the negroes were made slaves by those who bought them.*

"Is it right to make slaves against their will?"

Yes, it was right for God to doom this race to a state of bondage against their will. What punishment for sin was ever inflicted by divine or human law which was agreeable to the will, the depraved nature of man? The proposition would, if admitted as a general axiom or moral truth, that *no man shall be coerced into doing what is contrary to his own will*, break up every government, destroy every plan of improvement for humanity, and make the world like an opened menagerie of gentle animals and ferocious beasts. Coercion to authority, subjection to law, is, from the cradle to the grave, the lot of fallen man.

Is not work, hard labor, the punishment of disobedience to God's law? Why not frame a thesis thus—*Is it right to make men work against their will?* Would any philanthropist attempt to prove that work is wrong, because men, having "an inalienable right to liberty," should, in "the pursuit of happiness"—also an "inalienable right"—be free to do as they please with their own time; and hard work must, therefore, be abolished, or those who choose to do it must maintain those who prefer idleness?

This proposition would be scouted as absurd and impossible, because labor of some sort is the real basis of order, the only way of developing human powers and securing the progressive improvement of the race.

True, because God's laws have so fixed man's condition, *he must work.* Just as certainly do the laws of God fix the condition of the African or black race to be that of servitude or dependence on the white race, because the last is the superior; they work.

The English slave-trader did not "make men slaves against their will." The negroes\* in their own country were slaves,

\* Mr. Du Chaillu, who has spent four years in Africa, part of the time among cannibals, thus describes the people:

"The trade of these savages, he said, seemed to be confined to an exchange of dead bodies on which to feed. Human bones were found in large quantities, everywhere around their villages. He was never in danger among them, inasmuch as he was regarded as a magician, and they were afraid of him. The

always had been slaves, and knew no better condition. The white slave-trader bought black heathen slaves of black heathen masters, both of the same ignorant, degraded race, where no improvement of condition could ever take place, unless aid from a superior source intervened. The white trader brought these black slaves to the country of the highest European civilization, and sold them to white Christian masters, who could not help but aid, by instruction in the arts of labor and of moral conduct, these savage heathen in better knowledge than they could have possibly gained in Africa.

Now, the true question to be propounded was—*Is it right for white Christian men to hold black heathen men slaves?*

The cruelties of the slave-trade could have been quite as forcibly urged by Mr. Wilberforce and Thomas Clarkson under this thesis, and its abolition secured. Then the whole subject of slavery should have been tried by the laws of God—to whom all men owe obedience—by the interpretations of Scripture, and the common usages of all Christian nations: whether to return these black slaves to their own land of hopeless heathen bondage, or hold them in servitude in a Christian country till they had learned to labor and do their duties like responsible men, and “not to be chargeable to others;” or set them free in their ignorance, indolence, and poverty, to be a burden on the State, a nuisance to white people, and a clog on Christian civilization.

Had the British government, forty years ago, when the utter failure of emancipation to improve the negroes of the French West Indies was thoroughly proven, decided to hold their own colonies as they were, subject only to the means which public justice and private benevolence might provide for testing the character of the black man and his fitness for personal freedom, and then appropriated one-fifth, say, of the sum they afterwards squandered in setting the slaves free to this good purpose; expending the other eighty millions of dollars in their own country, educating and benefiting the white servile classes of England, Scotland, and Ireland; raising them from ignorance and pauperism, and making them intelligent and thrifty work people—what a glorious march in the cause of humanity might have been

---

tribes of negroes in Central Africa, other than the cannibals, were numerous. He had visited thirty-five of them, but found, notwithstanding, that the country was very sparsely populated. Owing to polygamy, the slave-trade, and general belief in witchcraft, many of the tribes were disappearing. When a king died, fifty or sixty people would be accused of witchcraft, in causing his demise, and themselves put to death. The foreign slave-trade was calculated on as a principal source of revenue, and slaves were regularly provided as a marketable commodity.”

gained ! what perplexed questions of political economy and Gospel philanthropy might have been solved !

The last forty years : what bitter strifes and burning passions have been kindled and excited in our own land during the last forty years, under these delusive and destructive dogmas that "all men are born equal," and all have an inalienable right to liberty—thus attempting to force down the Anglo-Saxon to the level of the African, make the black servant a peer to his white master, and prove that the Word of God is false when it declares that there is a race of men who "shall be servants of servants" to another race of men !

Has anything save evil resulted from these religious and political agitations ? Can any changes make the black man equal with the white man ? As well might a lapidary attempt to make a kohinoor out of coal. Chemists tell us that diamond and carbon are the same in elements, yet how unlike in appearance, use, and value. Thus the Anglo-Saxon and the negro are of the same blood, inherit the same blessed promises of salvation by and through a common Redeemer ; but in this life their destiny is not similar, their duties are not exchangeable. When placed together, the white race will and should rule, because the righteous Creator has so willed and directed in His Word.

The black race is made better and happier by service under white Christian masters ; and if the Christians of America and Great Britain really intend to do good to Africa and her children they must take the Bible standard of measurement as to the capacity and fitness of the race of Canaan for improvement and freedom, and work by that standard. The only real improvement in the negro as a *man* is found in Liberia ; hence the good influence of our southern institution of bond service for the black race is proven. Why, then, are such violent attempts made to break up and destroy this useful, this Bible institution ?

When we read the violent denunciations of the British press against "slavery in America," and the reports of speeches made by their clergymen against "*the sin of slavery*," it really seems as if those intelligent Christians and learned writers believed that the IDEA of "*holding one man as the property of another man*" had lately been invented in the lower regions, and that the prince of darkness had sold out the patent for the exclusive benefit of American slaveholders in our southern States.

Is there no Scotch clergyman who reads Hebrew, and believes that God meant what His servants were inspired to record in Gen. 9 : 25, 27—Ex. 20 : 10, 17—Lev. 22 : 10—24 : 44, 45, 46 ? Is there no searcher of the Pauline doctrines in the churches of Great Britain, who has faith in the Word ? Paul, in many

of his epistles, is as absolute and pointed in his instructions to master and servant, touching their relative duties, as he is to the husband and wife, or the parent and child. See Ephesians, chap. 6, v. 5, 6, 7, 8, 9; Colossians, chap. 3, v. 22, 23, 24; 1 Tim., chap. 6, v. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6; Titus, chap. 2, v. 9, 10. Peter, also, is most explicit—1 Peter, chap. 2, v. 18. In all these passages the relation of master and servant is as definite as language can make it. Not a word in all these instructions about running away or refusing to obey; on the contrary, fidelity to the master, whether the eye of the master was on the servant or not. See Ephesians, chap. 6, v. 6, 7, 8. And as a cheering encouragement to the faithful servant, Paul, in his glowing language, says, v. 8, "Knowing that whatsoever good any man doeth, the same shall he receive from the Lord, whether he be *bond* or *free*."

The clergy of Great Britain have much to answer for before God, in the course they have taken to foment discord in the American churches respecting slavery. Had it not been for their mistaken views regarding this institution, which led to West India emancipation, thus destroying the best means of improvement for their own colored slaves; and then stirring up and intensifying the same fanatical spirit—the worship of the French Goddess of Reason in the place of Jehovah—among the churches of America, the fearful storm of political agitation, threatening disunion, anarchy, and blood, would not now be sweeping over our United States.

It is said that Queen Victoria, when a foreign ambassador wondered at England's greatness, placed in his hands a Bible, saying, "This is the secret of Britain's prosperity: this is the code of laws by which we are governed."

Does not Queen Victoria base her claim to hold India on this Bible code that gives Japheth the right to dwell in the tents of Shem? And does not the Bible sanction as surely the right of Japheth to hold the posterity of Canaan in bondage?

If the Christians of Great Britain would shrink from the proposal to abandon the heathen of India to themselves, now that God has given the power over them into the keeping of the Anglo-Saxons, who have the open Bible in their hands, and are dispensing its light-giving knowledge through the dark places of Hindoo superstitions and falsities—its soul-saving love into the black depths of heathen cruelty and wickedness—so should they shrink from the God-defying doctrine that "all men are born equal, and have an *inalienable right to liberty*;" and therefore the negro bond-servant, the descendant of Ham, shall be made free, and be left to his own devices in the darkest cavern of heathenism.

See to what wickedness this assumption is tending. The British now seek to colonize Africa with Coolies. Negro slavery must not be recognized as lawful in Africa, though it has been an irrevocable institution there since that land was inhabited; so the race of Shem, *never doomed to be servants by the law of God*, are torn away from their own land, deceived into a worse than slave bondage; and these miserable Hindoos, more difficult to convert, because entangled in the crafty meshes of subtle, systematized superstitions, are to mingle with the child-like, ignorant, heathen negroes, and make their conversion to Christianity seemingly impossible.

If the West India negroes had not been freed in 1838, but rightly taught, and, with true Christian care and love, prepared for their duties, hundreds, ay, thousands would have been by this time educated and qualified to go out to Africa, their own fatherland, as assistants to establish British centres of civilization and Christian missions in the interior of Africa, in the only way which can be beneficial to all parties and do wrong to none.

Moreover, there are thousands on thousands of free negroes in America who *are not wanted here*, but would be of incalculable benefit to the British in establishing their colonies in Africa. Had no root of bitterness been allowed to spring up between the two branches of the Anglo Saxon race concerning this question of negro slavery, these free negroes and emancipated slaves might become, under British direction and protection, the pioneers of industry, arts, and improvements, such as must be introduced before the Gospel can be successfully preached to the native African on his own soil.

It should never be forgotten that "God is no respecter of persons:" master and slave, the white man and the black man, are equally subject to His laws; each bound to use the talents, be these one or ten, that He has given, and each is rewarded according to faithfulness. No fiction of man's personal liberty can supersede the fiat of the Creator. "I care not for fifty thousand aphorisms, God's Word against man's any day," says the eloquent Spurgeon. Can he show, from this word of God, a word condemning slaveholders or denouncing slavery as sin? And is it not strictly forbidden in God's Word "to do evil that good may come?"

Now, robbery, false witness, disobedience to law, destruction of property, and murder of white men and women by poison, sword, fire and rapine, have all been commended as right against slaveholders, if done to free negro slaves.\* Nay, these crimes

---

\*"Resolved, That they should rejoice in a successful slave insurrection in the South, and that in killing a slaveholder to obtain freedom, the slave is guilty



have all been committed in our land, and, so far as fanatical abolitionism could prevail, have been not only unpunished, but highly applauded.

From what source comes this spirit of demoniacal vengeance against slaveholders? Comes it from the Word of God? or from the suggestions of the devil? Its echo certainly comes to us from Exeter Hall and Liverpool, and from the Glasgow gatherings of abolitionists, where men, styling themselves Christian ministers, charged on the slaveholding system of America all manner of wickedness, evil influences, and unbelief. If these gentlemen would only take the trouble to search for the truth before yielding their minds to destructive errors, they would find that they are entirely wrong in their conclusions. It is in the ranks of the abolition agitators in the free States, and particularly among the clerical as well as lay leaders, that every species of fanaticism and delusion can be found. German mysticism, rationalism, deism, atheism, spiritualism, and all other *isms* pervade this class through and through. It is among this body of men, the leading abolitionists in America, that these very abominations which the clergy of Scotland denounce, find their most cherished abiding places.

"We want an anti-slavery Constitution, an anti-slavery Bible, and an anti-slavery God," exclaimed one of these leaders, now a republican member of Congress. Truly, they must have a new Bible, and a new God, before they can bring any divine testimony to condemn slaveholding as a sin or a wrong.

The South is now the conservative power of Bible Christianity in our land. Not an *ism* has taken root there. The religious culture of the negro slaves proves this. The earnest piety of these ignorant Africans could never have been kindled where *isms* are the fashionable modes of faith. The Bible must be *believed*; where its teachings have a hold on the heart, that makes men obey its injunctions. Unbelief, on the other hand, is always rebellious, inciting to selfishness, confusion, discord, and every evil work.

In our land this fierce and bloody-minded abolitionism has wrought evil, and only evil. All classes and conditions are sufferers from its false dogmas and pernicious experiments.

It has violated the Constitution, divided our churches, desecrated our pulpits, estranged Christian brethren, organized re-

of no crime; that the slaveholder *should be made to dream of death in his sleep, and to apprehend death in his dish and teapot—that FIRE SHOULD MEET HIM IN HIS BED, AND POISON SHOULD MEET HIM AT HIS TABLE.*"—*Resolution offered by Fred. Douglas.*

bellion against the laws of Congress, warred upon great public interests, destroyed the peace of neighborhoods, kindled sectional hatred, malice, and all uncharitableness, instigated to robbery, arson, murder, treason, and endeavored to stir up insurrections and civil warfare.

It has irreparably injured the negroes, by exciting false ideas of their own condition among them, leading them into acts of disobedience to law, as tools and victims of selfish demagogues, who seduce or steal these poor servants from a genial climate and indulgent masters, and send them to suffer or perish in the cold Canadas, or to drag out a miserable, often criminal, existence in the struggle of free labor in the free States.

We said "indulgent masters"—for this is the true character of nearly *all* the southern slaveholders. We will not urge the usual and true reasons for this kindness—that of early impressions, where negroes are the loving nurses of white children, who are to have rule over them; and the two races, mingling together in childhood's plays, learn to love each other as protector and dependent should, as *hired* labor never yet has learned. We will only take what matter-of-fact calculation can understand—the money price of negroes. This now ranges from *eight hundred to three thousand dollars* for an individual "person held to service," of either sex! Might not a Yankee or a Scotchman be trusted for care and kindness to such valuable "chattels?"

If this abolition excitement is to be continued till insurrections are fomented at the South, and the union of the States is broken up, then the benefits of slave labor will be destroyed, and, in their fierce outrages, these negroes, now pious, happy, and useful members of Christian families, must inevitably be dispersed or destroyed. The abolitionists will never make a St. Domingo of the South.

Do the statesmen and Christian leaders of the British people ever consider what would be the natural result of this awful catastrophe—the breaking up of the American Union—on their own country, on Protestantism, on the true interests of constitutional liberty and human progress? The London Cotton Supply Reporter, February 3d, 1860, has the following statement:

"The amount of actual capital invested in the cotton trade of this kingdom is estimated to be between £60,000,000 and £70,000,000 sterling.

"The quantity of cotton imported into this country in 1859 was 1,181½ million pounds' weight, the value of which, at 6d. per lb., is equal to £30,000,000 sterling. Out of 2,829,110 bales of cotton imported into Great Britain, America has supplied us with 2,086,341, that is five-sevenths of the whole. In other words, out of every 7 lb. imported from all countries into Great Britain, America has supplied 5 lb.

"Great Britain alone consumes annually £24,000,000 worth of cotton goods. Two conclusions, therefore, may safely be drawn from the facts and figures now

cited—first, that the interests of every cotton-worker are bound up with a gigantic trade which keeps in motion an enormous mass of capital, and this capital, machinery, and labor *depend for five-sevenths of its employment upon the slave States of America for prosperity and continuance*: secondly, *that if a war should at any time break out between England and America, a general insurrection take place among the slaves, disease sweep off those slaves by death, or the cotton crop fall short in quantity, whether from severe frosts, disease of the plant, or other possible causes, our mills would be stopped for want of cotton, employers would be ruined, and famine would stalk abroad among the hundreds and thousands of work people who are at present fortunately well employed.*

“Calculate the consequences for yourself. Imagine a dearth of cotton, and you may picture the horrors of such a calamity from the scenes you may possibly have witnessed when the mills have only run on “short time.” Count up all the trades that are kept going out of the wages of the working classes, independent of builders, mechanics, engineers, colliers, &c., employed by the mill owners. Railways would cease to pay, and our ships would lie rotting in their ports, should a scarcity of the raw material for manufacture overtake us.”

All these material interests are to be hazarded, in order to give three or four millions of negroes the liberty of being hired laborers, instead of slave laborers! Is the condition of the former so much better that it should be forced on the South at such fearful risk? We have proven from the Word of God that both conditions of labor have been appointed by the Creator. In denying this, infidelity rejects the Bible, appeals to its three Thomases—Paine, Jefferson, Clarkson—as apostles of personal freedom, for the “inalienable right” of the posterity of Ham to freedom. Will the Christians of Britain bow down to this worship of man’s reason, and insist on liberty and equality for the two races? This is the true question.

Under both modes of labor there are hardships, wrongs, and sufferings that should be redressed; but that the southern black slave is far better cared for and more comfortable in his condition than the white hired slaves of Britain, is a fact that no British writer who valued truth would attempt to controvert.

Abolition clergymen, so furious in denouncing their Christian brethren in America who hold slaves, must see, in their own land, multitudes of half-starved, hired laborers, and more wretched because starving laborers, who cannot get work.\* Reports of

---

\* “In the sale of slaves (in America) nothing but labor is transferred. It passes from master to master, as it passes, in countries of hired labor, from employer to employer. The mode in which the transfer is made differs in the two systems of labor. The slave laborer is never compelled to hunt for work and starve till he finds it. Is this an evil to the laborer? Would it be thought an evil, by the hired man in Europe, that his employer should be obliged, by law, to find him another employer before dismissing him from service?

“But, it is said, the slave is too much exposed to the master’s abuse of power; he is liable to wrongs without a remedy; and, so far, his condition is below that of the hired laborer.

“If this be true at all, it is true as regards the able-bodied hired man only.

the pauper and outcast population of Glasgow alone shows such degradation and misery as would seem to demand all the sympathies and charities of the Christians of Scotland. Even those pious, respectable laborers, who do not sink into pauperism, have a fierce struggle to make against the wants and woes of life, as Scotia's greatest poet has drawn the picture from his own heart sorrows :

" See yonder poor, o'er-labored wight,  
So abject, mean, and vile,  
Who begs a brother of the earth  
To give him leave to toil ;  
And see his lordly fellow-worm  
The poor petition spurn,  
Unmindful, though a weeping wife,  
And helpless offspring mourn !"

The fat, well-fed negro slave of the South, who goes to his own cabin after his day's task is done, and takes down his fiddle for amusement, or puts on his best coat to go to the prayer meeting, would feel himself insulted by a comparison with the poor Scotch laborer.

And yet British Christians, turning coldly from the sufferings of free subjects, their own pauper brethren, would wish us to believe they feel a tender sympathy for the slaves of America, who are living year in and year out, from infancy to old age, in such plenty and freedom from care as many pauper-born free subjects of Britain never enjoyed for a single day in their lives.

They know not what they do, these British abolitionists, nor whither their course is tending. If what they, with the Ameri-

But take into the account children and women, those for example, that work naked in coal mines, or wives whose sufferings from the brutal treatment of husbands daily fill the reports of police courts ; take these into the reckoning, and the difference in the consequences of abused power will be very small. The negro slave is as thoroughly protected as any laborer in Europe. He is protected from every other man's wrong-doing by the ready interference of his master ; he is guarded from the master's abuse by the laws of the land, and a vigilant, earnest public opinion. Let all cruelty be punished ; let all abuse of power be restrained ; but to abolish the relation of master and slave, because there are bad masters and ill-treated slaves, would not be a whit wiser than to abolish marriage, because there are brutal husbands and murdered wives.

" Yet, surely, it will be said, it must be admitted, after all, that slavery is an evil. Yes, certainly, it is an evil ; but in the same sense only in which servitude or hired labor is an evil. To gain one's bread by the sweat of one's brow, is a curse. But it is a curse attended with a blessing. It is an evil that shuts out a greater evil. Labor for wages, labor for subsistence, and subjection to the authority of employer or master, are the conditions on which alone the laboring masses, white or black, can live with advantage to themselves and to society."—*From De Bow's Review, January, 1860, pages 56 and 57.*



